The Corrupt Catholic Cult

A survey of the official teachings of
Pope John Paul II, since Vatican II,

as presented by the Knights of Columbus and
"Catholic Answers" (Karl Keating) published in
San Diego, California in 1991–1992.

The Corrupt Catholic Cult

A survey of the official teachings of
Pope John Paul II, since Vatican II,

as presented by the Knights of Columbus and
"Catholic Answers" (Karl Keating) published in
San Diego, California in 1991–1992.

The
Corrupt Catholic Cult

Dr. Peter S. Ruckman

President, Pensacola Bible Institute

B.A., B.D., M.A., Th.M., Ph.D.

COPYRIGHT © 1999 by Peter S. Ruckman

All Rights Reserved

(PRINT) ISBN 1-58026-214-7

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The Scripture quotations found herein are from the text of the Authorized *King James* Version of the Bible. Any deviations therefrom are not intentional.

BB BOOKSTORE

P.O. Box 7135 Pensacola, FL 32534

www.kjv1611.org

Other works available on Kindle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. The Issue of Final Authority

2. Proving Inspiration

3. Was Peter in Rome?

4. Can You Swallow God?

5. Are All Popes Campbellites?

6. Mary, Mary Quite Contrary

Postscript

INTRODUCTION

As the Catholic Church takes over Eastern Europe (1996) and sets up the ten-federated "revived Roman Empire" under its sixth and final ruler, the religious and theological corruptions of the old Whore on Seven Hills go on without a letup, as they have gone on for sixteen centuries. Hitler's Austrian I.D. card, carried for the Nazi Party, was number 555. This puts him in a salient position that no one could deny, for he was proceeded by *four* Roman rulers who were all anti-Semitic and who were "world conquerors" in their days. These men were Caesar (111), Constantine the Great (222), Charlemagne (333), and Napoleon (444). Obviously, the next man "into the ring" will be *666:* he will have to be a world conqueror connected with Rome, and he will have to be strongly anti-Semitic. John Paul came from the most anti-Semitic country in Europe—Poland, the home of Auschwitz and Treblinka.

The following information is published through a Roman Catholic lawyer in San Diego, California, whom I had a debate with several years ago. This outfit is now called *"Catholic Answers"* and consists of a national "tract ministry"; the pagan Papists finally having realized the value of "tracts." This godless outfit prints fifty "tracts" just like those published by Moody Press, Good News Publishers, The Herald Press, Pilgrim Press, and so forth, back "in the old days" (1950–1970). This is the most *up-to-date* and *modern* presentation of official Roman Catholic doctrine as officially taught in America today by the Papists. A comparison of two dozen of these tracts shows it is exactly the same collection of blasphemous myths and fables discussed in *Rome, The Great Private Interpreter*, which we wrote nearly *thirty-five years ago.* Nothing has changed. Vatican II (John XXIII) changed absolutely *nothing,* and the Roman stance *against* the Holy Scriptures and the Body of Christ is just as strong and just as *non-Biblical* as it was before World War II, or the American Revolution for that matter. If you want these tracts to check the information for yourself—in case you think we are about to "slander" the Catholic church or "defame" Catholic Christians—here is the address so you can obtain the material for yourself: CATHOLIC ANSWERS, P.O. Box 17181, San Diego, California 92117.

If you want the *Scriptural material* that proves that every MAJOR theological teaching of the Catholic Church—the Mass, Purgatory, prayers

to dead saints, the use of images in worship, the Confessional, the Perpetual Virginity of Mary and the Assumption of Mary, the sacrament of sprinkling, and the foundation of "Christ's church"—is just as false as HELL, write to the Bible Baptist Bookstore, P.O. Box 7135, Pensacola, Florida 32534 for the work called *Rome—The Great Private Interpreter.* It was written in 1960 but was not published until 1969. All the material in it will apply directly to *everything* found in *Catholic Answers* from San Diego, published in 1992, or since then.

When you find a Baptist and a Catholic in the same ecumenical "bed" together, one of them (or both of them) has to be sound asleep. No *genuine* Baptist could stand five seconds in any ecumenical effort with a *genuine* Roman Catholic. The historical judgment of the centuries (A.D. 100 to A.D. 1900) is there can be no "fellowship of righteousness with unrighteousness" and no fellowship between the "temple of God and idols."

The Montanists, Donatists, Messalines, Euchites, Waldenses, Albigenses, Lollards, Bogomiles, Paulicians, and "Protestants" all believed that the Second Commandment was against graven images. No Roman Catholic believed that ANY such commandment was ever given to Moses or anyone else. There is no commandment against graven images and idols in the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20) according to every official reproduction of the "Ten" Commandments ever published by ANY Catholic outlet since A.D. 325. Check *any* and *all* of them.

Imagine any real Bible believer—let alone an adult-immersing Baptist —talking about "fellowship" and "dialogue" with such an outfit. It is impossible. If the only thing wrong with the Papal hierarchy was their purposeful and deliberate striking out of Exodus 20:4–5, as one of the Ten Commandments, it would be reason enough for any Christian breaking off fellowship with the whole pagan cult, even if you weren't a "Baptist." No Bible believer rejects Exodus 20:4–5 as one of the Ten Commandments; that is strictly Roman Catholic dogma as taught by every Priest, Bishop, and Pope in the cult of Catholicism since A.D. 500.

Now, I have here, before me, five of these 50 "tracts." None of them are Biblical or even approach Scriptural truth. They make use of Jimmy Swaggart's material as the official "Fundamentalist position" for all Bible-believing Protestants. This is "handy," as you can see. It would be the equivalent of us using the speeches of *Adolph Hitler* to represent the Roman

Catholic position; Hitler was a born, sprinkled, catechized, confirmed Roman Catholic who was never excommunicated from the Roman church *before, during,* or *after* the "Holocaust," and he said, "I am, and will always remain, a Catholic."

Jimmy Swaggart would look pretty good alongside the outstanding Roman Catholic leaders in history: Lucky Luciano, Al Capone, *Adolph Hitler,* Bloody Mary, *Heinrich Himmler,* Rock Hudson, Germann Goering, *Vito Genovese,* Francisco Franco, Fidel Castro, Josef Goebbels, *Torquemada,* Rudolph Hoess, Franz Stangl, *Adam Weiskopf,* Charles II, Pablo Escobar, *Catherine DeMedici,* Albert Anastasia, Allende, Batiste, Pancho Villa, Frank Gotti, and *Frank Sinatra.*

In the first place, Jimmy Swaggart was a CHARISMATIC, like all the Catholic priests who pushed the Catholic-Charismatic dialogue in the 1970s and 1980s. In the second place, Swaggart no more represented 2,000 Baptist pastors in American than the Pope represents Jesus Christ. And in the third place, Jimmy's moral life was just as clean as over 200 homosexual priests who don't even believe what Swaggart believed that *was* Scriptural. A busted clock is right two times a day. Any child-molesting priest—and a dozen have been flushed in the last two years (1990–1991)—can be "right" about the Deity of Christ and the Virgin Birth, and be as corrupt as Hell. Many of them were not merely pornographic perverts, but *murderers* as well (see *Vatican Imperialism in the Twentieth Century,* Avro Manhattan, 1965, pp. 355–370). Citing Swaggart, to prove the Scriptures are false, is an old Jesuit "gimmick." It is like Curtis Hutson or Bob Jones III quoting "Ruckman"—when he is telling the truth—hoping that Ruckman's *reputation* will offset the truth and *overthrow the Scriptures.*

"Birds of a feather flock together."

The Issue of Final Authority

> "As the Catholic Creed of Saint Athanasius says: 'Whosoever wishes to be SAVED, before all good works, must hold unto the Catholic Faith, for unless a person keeps THE FAITH, WHOLE AND ENTIRE, he will UNDOUBTEDLY BE LOST FOREVER."
>
> (*The Fatima Crusader,* 1991, p. 6)

Karl Keating (and his master) recognize the main issue is *final authority*, so in a tract called *"What's Your Authority for that?"* they warn Catholics not to let any personal worker engage him in Scriptural conversation on salvation before making him "establish his authority" first. The reason for this is that the Papal hierarchy claims for *itself*—and always has—the right to *the final authority in all matters of faith and practice,* plus all secular and religious matters, plus every decision on earth that deals with the Bible, translations, or theological positions. *A Catholic delivers his conscience to his church from birth to death.* No other authority is to usurp its place, so what Karl Keating is getting the Roman Catholic ready for—who is about to be witnessed to—is to reject *every verse* and *every word* in the Scriptures that *conflicts* with the private interpretation of his bachelor priesthood.

Karl Keating warns the Catholic "laity" that a Christian "personal worker" will fall back on the *Scriptures* as the final authority; then he says, "Before turning to the verses he brings up, and thus to the topic he brings up, DEMAND that he demonstrate first how he can tell that the Bible is the rule of faith and even what constitutes 'A BIBLE'." (*The original of this is in Gen. 3:1–5.*) What follows in the tract is nothing but a reproduction of the conversation that took place between me and Father Sullivan (St. Michael's) in the spring of 1949. Evidently, there is an SOP setup for getting rid of God's authority, which is standard in all Catholic churches.

Upon being shown 2 Timothy 3:16, the Roman Catholic is told to ward it off with, "Well, it doesn't say that the Scriptures ALONE are the rule of faith, does it?" This sets up the rest of the conversation. This is the

Alexandrian “heave-ho”—the old “dual authority” gimmick used by Bob Jones III, Stewart Custer, Zane Hodges, James White, Arthur Farstad, Bob Ross, James Price, Wilbur Pickering, and every apostate Fundamentalist in America: *you set up two or more conflicting authorities so that YOU can be the final authority.* This is the original “Catholic” position. It became established in the fourth and fifth centuries to nullify the Scripture with the traditions of the “church fathers” (Tertullian, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Origen, Clement, et al.).

Then the Catholic is shown how to get rid of the personal worker by saying this: “The Bible is NOT a catechism or a theological treatise. You won’t find one (New Testament book) that spells out the elements of the faith the way TODAY’S CATECHISMS do, or even as the ancient CREEDS do.”

Now, this is the Cultic approach. You pretend that to be a Christian “rule of faith” the “rules” have to be written out in a logical order and organized to present a Systematized Theology (a Roman Catholic Catechism). Of course, this is superstitious nonsense.

The RULES for Christian living and the elements of faith are spelled out in *eighth-grade terms* in Romans 6–7, 12, 14; Galatians 5–6; 1 Thessalonians 4–5; and Ephesians 1–6, where no one could miss them if they READ the Bible.

The theology on the Deity of Christ is described in detail in Ephesians 1; Colossians 1; 1 Timothy 3; Galatians 1, 4; Hebrews 1; and Philippians 2.

The theology of the Virgin Birth and the Crucifixion are documented, analyzed, and EXPLAINED in Luke 1–3; Matthew 1–2; John 1; Acts 4; Romans 5–7; Philippians 2; Colossians 1; and Romans 5.

The theology of the Local Church and the Body of Christ is detailed in Acts 1–4; Revelation 1–3; Acts 13–14; Colossians 1; Ephesians 1, 5; and 1 Corinthians 12.

The theology of the Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormons is refuted in Luke 16; John 5, 10; Colossians 1; 1 Corinthians 15; Revelation 14, 20, 22; and Romans 8.

The theology of the Roman Catholics is thoroughly examined and negated in Psalm 69; 1 Timothy 2; Hebrews 10; Matthew 23; John 6; and Mark 9.

All of the theological doctrines on *life, death, hell, heaven, the judgment, the restoration of Israel, the Second Coming, and the Millennial Reign* are given in DETAIL in Hebrews 1–10; Romans 8–9; Galatians 4–6; 1 Thessalonians 4; 1 Corinthians 15; Revelation 13–22; Jeremiah 33; Joel 2; Isaiah 2, 14, 65–66; and two dozen other chapters.

Keating lied. It was just that these doctrines were not laid out by God in the Bible as a *Roman Catholic catechism* (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), so he wants you to think they are not *there*. God fixed it so a man had to READ the Bible to find the truth. Roman Catholics are not *Bible readers.* You can see why in a moment.

"There was no attempt (in the Bible) to impart basic instructions to *nonbelievers* or to summarize everything for *believers."* Note how carefully the words are chosen. This Catholic Jesuistry is to make you THINK that the books of the Bible were not written to tell a man how to *get saved* (nonbelievers) and were not written to tell you what a believer should *believe.* Observe how craftily this is worded. He didn't actually *say* what he intended for you to believe. By substituting "BASIC INSTRUCTIONS" to nonbelievers for "THE PLAN OF SALVATION," and by substituting "SUMMARIZE EVERYTHING" for believers instead of "COMPLETE INSTRUCTIONS," he led you into the ditch. That is where the blind lead the blind. *That is how an unsaved Catholic can damn the unwary sinner.*

The *plan of salvation* is found in Romans 5 and Romans 10, and the Gospel of John was written for the sole purpose of getting a *nonbeliever to believe* (John 20:31); that is, if you believe the Author who wrote that Gospel (John 21:24). No "Catechism" contains any better "basic instructions" than those Scriptures.

Now, do you fully grasp what this Catholic apologist is driving at here? He is trying to keep the BOOK *closed* so the Scriptures cannot be *quoted* or *read*. He is infected with Bibliophobia. His purpose is to nullify ANY Scripture the personal worker might *quote*. To attain this, the instructions given are as follows: "Most of the epistles, for example, were written to churches having problems. Paul or John [see above!], or another writer, would try to solve THESE problems." That is, Paul and John would not tell you how to get saved and give YOU the plan of salvation. See how it's done?

When the personal worker says that he thinks the Bible is the "BASIS of the Christian faith," the Catholic is to DENY this and claim that it couldn't be so because "the Christian faith" existed "*before* the New Testament was written" and the "first book of the New Testament was composed decades *after* the Ascension."

Note how the pagan propagandist trusted you would confuse the "faith" with THE BIBLE and "basis" for "background." See it above? The personal worker was made to say "New Testament" and the Catholic was to refer to some "faith" that existed *before the New Testament.* Well, the faith that existed BEFORE the Ascension was *orthodox Judaism*, with three-fourths of the Bible complete before the first "Catholic" came out of the bushes. Keating is pretending that TODAY "the Christian faith"—meaning Roman Catholicism—is the one that was around in A.D. 30–33. No such thing ever existed. When the New Testament books were written they *denied Roman Catholicism*. (See Matt. 23; Heb. 10; 1 Tim. 2:5, etc.) Every disciple was a Jew, *not a Gentile;* everyone of them attended a *Jewish temple* for worship (see Acts 3:1); every male among them was *circumcised* and had a *beard,* and not one of them could eat pork, catfish, clams, lobsters, or shrimp on ANY day of the week, *including Friday.*

This is "THE CHRISTIAN FAITH," is it? Now where is Karl Keating headed? Can't you guess? What he is trying to do here is open the way so that Roman Catholic myths, legends, fairy stories, and hallucinations can replace *THE SCRIPTURE* as authoritative. To do this, he has to convince you that UNWRITTEN ORAL *TRADITIONS* are equal to (and even superior to) what was going to be written. That, is they are too BASE (Basis) for the New Testament.

So here he is at work telling his Catholic friend that the best way to AVOID the conversation on the New Birth and Salvation is to *question the authority of the Scriptures* that were *written* (see Gen. 3:1; 1 Kings 13:21; and 1 Samuel 15 for a typical Catholic handling of what God said).

Having avoided the Scriptural truth that there were no "Christians" present in Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John (or Acts 1–10 for that matter!), Keating has led the sucker to believe that "Christians" had the complete "Christian faith" *during the time of Christ.* No disciple on earth is called a "Christian" until Acts 11:26, and then, he is NOT anyone like Peter, James, or John: *he is a converted Gentile.* Keating knew his Catholic reader was

not a Bible reader and wouldn't check the Bible against FALSEHOOD. You see, "The Christian Faith" is identical with "The Catholic Faith" in the minds and writings, decrees, and encyclicals of every Catholic priest, Pope, bishop, Archbishop, and Cardinal who ever lived. But according to the Scripture, a modern Catholic should be attending the temple in Jerusalem DAILY (Acts 2:46), he should abstain from both pork and catfish, he should be *circumcised* if he is a male, he should have a *beard* if he is a male (Lev. 19:27), *and he should be selling all his property* (Acts 2:44) *and dividing the money up among other Catholics.*

This is "THE CHRISTIAN FAITH" *before the first book in the New Testament is written.*

Why didn't Keating tell the Catholic suckers that it was? Easy: $$$$.

He would have 400,000,000 defectors from the "ONE TRUE CHRISTIAN FAITH." *His pupils are NOT Bible readers:* Catholics are *never* Bible readers even when they *profess* to be. If they were, they would know that the term "Christian" doesn't even occur one time in history *until "decades" after the Resurrection.* You couldn't find a Pope or a Bishop or a nun or a nuncio or a Cardinal anywhere in the New Testament, let alone BEFORE the New Testament was written.

Now, let these things "sink down deep into your ears." The so-called "CHRISTIAN FAITH" Keating is talking about never existed *BEFORE the New Testament was written or after it was written.* He is talking about the present "Roman Catholic" faith (1998) which not only did not exist anywhere *during* the lifetime of Peter, James, John, Jude, and Paul, but is found *nowhere* except in cultic oral traditions that CONFLICT with the entire body of New Testament revelation when it was written. See, for example: 1 Timothy 2:5.

To show you how crucial this matter is, watch the Catholic tract telling the Catholic what to do next. Next, Keating says, "How do you know what constitutes a New Testament canon? How do you know these twenty-seven books are inspired and should be gathered together to form the New Testament and not some other books"?

Note that this is how Keating opened the debate we had in California back in 1980. There he got the wrong man. We had already been through that routine with Father Sullivan at St. Michael's, back in 1949. We knew where he was heading. He was getting ready to say that if the *Roman*

Catholic hierarchy had not *listed* those New Testament books and *defined* the number, God the Holy Spirit could NOT have shown you, *or anyone else,* that they were *inspired*. Keating is "setting you up for the kill." He is going to make you think that some Catholic "World Congress of Fundamentalism" determined the canon of the New Testament by an official pronouncement so that YOU must be dependent upon its decree.

But to prove this outrageous lie, all he can do is refer to where Augustine said, "I would not *believe* in the gospels were it not for the authority of *the Catholic Church."* This godless statement from an African apostate, *who approved of killing the Baptists of his day* (the Donatists, see *The History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. I, pp. 105–106), is now applied to every saved Bible believer in the world by saying "ANY Christian accepting the authority of the New Testament does so, whether or not he admits it, on the SAY-SO of the CATHOLIC CHURCH."

To which the "personal worker" may answer: *BLOW IT OUT YOUR NOSE.*

It was the Roman Catholic Church that officially CURSED Jesus Christ at the Council of Trent by declaring that anyone was CURSED (anathema) if they did not accept the *Apocrypha* into the canon as part of the Old Testament! The Catholic Church did not even get the right *number of books* for the Old Testament that Peter, James, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John had to use *before* the New Testament was written.

How in the name of Heaven could such blundering, blasphemous FOOLS set up the canonical standard for the New Testament? *They couldn't.* The Holy Spirit set up the number. It was the AUTHOR of Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16) who led the Body of Christ—not some Roman Catholic bunch of "fathers"—**"into all truth"** (John 16:13) and showed them **"things to come"** (John 16:13) and bore witness (John 16:14) to the JEWISH **"oracles of God"** given to the Jew (Rom. 3:1–2). Both Testaments were written by JEWS, *not Roman Catholics.*

If some church council, after A.D. 350, decided that twenty-seven books should be in the New Testament, you can bet your bottom dollar that all twenty-seven books were accepted by the Body of Christ *before* A.D. 200, and the only ones who would dispute any of them (*"Antilegomena"*) would be a group of *professional, smooth, slick, highly-educated,*

destructive, Bible critics: like those at Bob Jones, Liberty University, or who assembled at Trent in 1546.

Now the Roman Catholic is told to imitate his father (John 8:43–44; Gen. 3:1). He is to bombard the personal worker with *questions* to insure that the matter of Salvation and the New Birth is not brought up.

"But is it really obvious? What is so obvious in Philemon to indicate that it was inspired? How do you handle that? And what is so obviously unorthodox in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Epistle of Clement?* You can demonstrate that they seem as orthodox as the New Testament writings themselves. What is in these books that makes them inspired? How can you say it is obvious which books are inspired and which *aren't?"*

Go back and read that. Do you know what that is? That is the talk of an *unsaved agnostic* who has rejected the New Testament as being inspired of God even where he *professes* to believe it, because his church *professed* to believe it: neither of them believe it. He planted *five doubts in your mind* because they were in HIS MIND (Gen. 3:1).

I have the *"Shepherd"* and good ole' *"Clement"* right here on the table. They are about as "orthodox" as *The Epistle of Barnabas* or *The Gospel of Peter* or *The Acts of Paul.* Any Bible reader—Catholics don't read the Bible—could find ten to forty verses in the New Testament that completely refute the heterodoxy found in the *"Shepherd"* and *"Clement."*

Keating lied again. He said you could "DEMONSTRATE that they seem as *orthodox* as the New Testament writings." "Demonstrate" to *whom?* Some poor, *blind Papists* who can't find Daniel's Seventieth Week with a laser beam? To *whom* could it be demonstrated? Some nut who thought that a Catholic Catechism was "Scriptural"? Any Bible reader can find theological holes all through Papias, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Augustine, Jerome, and Origen; holes big enough to drive an 18-wheeler diesel through—*any Bible reader can.* Catholics are simply not *Bible readers;* they are readers of "SYSTEMATIZED CATECHISMS" (see above).

And now comes the coup de grace. Here is where the Papist was headed from the starting gun. "If the Bible which WE received from the Catholic Church [when he said "we" he meant only Catholics] is our sole rule of faith, WHO IS TO DO THE *INTERPRETING?"*

Well, certainly not the Roman Church, for he left out the word "ROMAN" when he wrote "Catholic Church," just like the news media has done for seventy years. Well, certainly any *author* of ANY book would be more adept at *interpreting* it than any *reader*. You see, he lied when he said, "WE received from the Catholic Church." First Timothy said the Bible came from GOD; *it did not come by way of ANY "Catholic" or any Catholic Church.* It came by the way of *the Jews* (Rom. 3:1–2), according to the New Testament, and all the authors of the New Testament, humanly speaking, were JEWS; *not Catholics.*

"WHO IS TO DO THE INTERPRETING?"

What a question for a man to ask who has passed the sixth grade! *"Who is to do the interpreting?"* Why, bless my soul, any sixth-grade reader would know that one if he read EITHER TESTAMENT (Gen. 40:8; Dan. 2:19, 22; Deut. 29:29; John 8:47; Luke 24:25; John 16:13). "Who is to do the *interpreting?"* Why, God told you that if you or your priest, or your Pope or your church did it, *instead of the One who had the authority* (the third person of the Godhead), it would be corrupt, for it would be **"private interpretation"** (2 Pet. 1:20).

Now, the alibi given to the Catholic, to permanently ward off any further discussion of New Testament salvation by the personal worker, is this: "Why are there so many variant understandings even among Evangelicals and Fundamentalists"?

This last piece of sophistry is stuck in to make you think the *Author* of the Scriptures (the Holy Spirit) cannot be the *interpreter* because those who profess to believe the Bible disagree on specific interpretations of specific passages. (By the way, the analogous Catholic answer to this should be, "We Catholics all agree about the proper interpretation for EVERY passage," which, of course, is another outrageous lie. Most Catholics [98 percent] don't know what their church teaches about 20,000 verses in the Bible. Since they don't even know *where* these 20,000 verses *are,* and since they delivered their consciences to the hierarchy *so they would not have to look them up*—Catholics are not Bible readers—when they say "we all agree," it means *nothing*.) The whole Catholic hierarchy split clean down the middle: first with the Greek Orthodox and then in 1309 over who the Antichrist was, with half the church saying it was the Pope at Avignon and half of the church saying it was the Pope at Rome. Again, in 1870, they split

their britches clean down the middle over the blasphemous doctrine of an infallible church being able to make infallible utterances through an infallible Pope, with eighty-seven Bishops and twenty-one Archbishops saying the other Catholics (415) were LIARS. *Seventy-six bishops were not even there to vote.*

Where was the "infallible teaching church" (the only true and correct interpreter of the Scriptures) when all of this divisive *hell* broke loose?

Pius XII said all Germans should pray for Adolph Hitler and pledge allegiance to the Third Reich. What was the Catholic pope's interpretation of Genesis 12:1–4 and Romans 11:25–28 in the light of this? Easy. *Neither he nor his church had any position on either passage.* No Catholic pays any attention to *any* verse of Scripture that contradicts his *system*. He is not even under any obligation to look it up to get anyone's interpretation on it. Today, Rome is split right down the middle over Liberation Theology and abortion, but here is Karl Keating trying to make you think that only Bible-believing Christians "disagree" about interpretations. He is dead wrong.

In *Catholicism Against Itself* (Lambert, 1956), you will find where the official publications of the official Catholic publishing companies (bearing the imprimatur of the archbishop) CONTRADICT EACH OTHER on Biblical passages and Church interpretations more than 200 times through a period of 1,500 years.

If the Holy Spirit can't do a better job of interpreting the Book He wrote than the Vatican hierarchy or the Papal cult can, you had better convert to Hinduism. Popes *arrest* each other (John XXIII), *kill* each other (John XIII), *commit adultery* (John XVIII), order *mass murder* (Clement IV), and *Genocide* (Urban IV), and then claim that the HOLY SPIRIT is *NOT* the interpreter of Scripture: their "CHURCH" is!

In closing accounts here, notice how the Papist always skirts the truth and avoids it by any means possible by calling attention to disagreements in interpretation among believers. For example, anyone with an ounce of sense knows perfectly well why some Bible believers thought you could "lose it" and some thought you *couldn't.* Any Bible believer who is honest knows why some Bible believers accepted baby sprinkling and others didn't. NO CATHOLIC UNDERSTANDS WHY, and the reason why is that he and his church are guilty of private interpretation (2 Pet. 1:19–20) to an extent that would make Adolph Hitler appear as a conservative Republican.

Variations in interpretations of Scripture among Bible believers are due to:

1. Some Christian *adding* words to a verse that are not in the verse. For example: all Catholics and Campbellites add the word "baptism" to John 3:5, *when it is not there*, and add the word "water" to Romans 6:1–3 and Ephesians 4:5, *when it is not there*. For example: *all Roman Catholics* add seven books to the Old Testament as a part of the **"oracles of God"** in the canon. For example: adding the word "Mary" to 1 Timothy 2:5, after being told the only Mediator was a MALE: *there are no "mediatrixes."*

2. Some Christian *subtracting* from the words of a verse (see Gen. 3:2 for the original). For example: *all Roman Catholics* have removed **"first born"** from Matthew 1:25, and the Vatican manuscript in Rome has removed Hebrews 10:10–14 from its Greek text. For example: all Campbellites refuse to quote the last eight words in Mark 16:16, and *all Roman Catholics* have removed the word **"study"** from 2 Timothy 2:15. All modern versions have removed **"appearance"** from 1 Thessalonians 5:22.

The first two sins committed on this earth, *as recorded by the Author and Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures,* are subtracting from and adding to the words of God (Gen. 3). No Roman Catholic was around when these oracles was given to a Jew: not one Roman Catholic or any "Catholic" church.

No one who reads the Bible would be even mildly surprised as to why "Christians differ in their interpretations over certain passages."

3. Some carnal Christians produce false doctrines by *taking a text out of context.* For example: *all Catholics* ignore Christ's dealing with Peter as SATAN in the very passage the Pope claimed to prove that Peter was the foundation of the Roman Church (Matt. 16:23). For example: *all Catholics* and Campbellites remove Acts 2:38 from its *Jewish* context where the message is addressed to Judean *Jews*, *Jews* of the Dispersion, and *Jewish* proselytes on a *Jewish* feast day, before "THE CHRISTIAN FAITH" is defined in the Pauline epistles. Keating does this after just claiming that the way to dodge the Pauline **"gospel of the grace of God"** (Rom. 4:4–5, 10:9–10; Eph. 2:8–9) is to pretend that those epistles were just written to "particular audiences for particular purposes." Then he applies Acts 2:38 to a *GENTILE CHRISTIAN* after the gospel of Galatians 1:8–10 and 1

Corinthians 15:1–6 superseded it. For example: extracting John 6:55–56 from John 6:63 so you would think that Christ's literal BLOOD and His literal FLESH could be cannibalized and affect your *SPIRITUAL* life.

4. Many Christians differ in interpretation because, like *all Roman Catholics*, they will not **"study"** to "rightly divide the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15). Consequently, they misplace Hebrews 3:6, 14, 6:1–5, 10:26–33; Rev. 14:12, 12:17, 22:14 (and so on) into the Church Age, instead of the Tribulation. All Roman Catholic priests, Bishops, and Popes do this.

For example: all Liberals, Modernists, and *Catholics* think that the "plan of salvation" and the "Christian faith" is in an Old Testament discourse, under the Law (Matt. 5–7), given to Old Testament Jews under the Law; this is the famous *Sermon on the Mount.*

The truth is, every split in the Body of Christ, over doctrinal matters, from Acts 15:1–20 on, comes from *professing Christians* doing one of the four things that the *Roman Catholic Church* has steadily practised for more than 1,500 years:

1. *Subtracting* from the words of God (Gen. 3:2).
2. *Adding* to the words of God (Gen. 3:3).
3. Taking verses out of their *context* (1 Cor. 9:27, for example).
4. *Refusing to study* because of the fear of man or fear that the Book itself may contradict some cherished belief or "historical position" (Bibliophobia), that is connected to the Vatican's INCOME or IMAGE.

In arming his fellow church members against the "ravages" of Scriptural truth and Biblical Christianity, Karl Keating, in this tract, not only REFUSED to discuss these crucial matters, he didn't even MENTION them. What he was after (after all) was to get the Catholic out of a real crisis: *being dealt with about Salvation and the New Birth.* In his final advice to his fugitives from truth, Karl tells them to ask the personal worker, "You're all 'Bible-believing Christians,' but which GROUP is right?" Here the "confounded" personal worker is supposed to say "Why *my group,* of course." To which the victorious *unsaved Catholics* is to reply sarcastically, "OF COURSE!" *Keating doesn't know much about personal work.* You see, no one is saved or born again by following ANY group. Salvation is *personal*.

In 1984, a twenty-two year old Roman Catholic—having just graduated from college—gave me Karl Keating's identical Papist line. He wound up

with, “Well, I went to a Church of Christ and they said one thing; and I have also been to a Methodist church and they said something else; you Baptists quote Scripture to prove you are right, and the Jehovah’s Witnesses quote Scripture to prove they’re right, so WHO’S RIGHT?” (This was the exact tactic Keating recommended for his cult in *“What’s Your Authority for That?”*.)

Do you think I was as stupid as that Roman Catholic lawyer? Guess again.

When that unsaved, educated fool asked, “WHO IS RIGHT?”, my reply was *“You ought to be ashamed of yourself!”* He said, “What? Why do you say that?” I said, “Didn’t you just tell me you were twenty-two years old and have a college education?” “Yes,” he confessed. “Do you mean to tell me,” I asked, “that a twenty-two year old, college-educated, American MALE doesn’t know enough about the one inspired Book more than to tell when a minister or priest is *perverting it* or LYING to him?”

He got red in the face and ducked his head. He had never even *thought* of such a thing. Neither did a Catholic lawyer. *Catholics are not Bible readers*. They couldn’t possibly know if their own priest or Pope was *lying* to them. *“You ought to be ashamed of yourself!”* I repeated.

He was. He should have been. *So should YOU.*

A Bible believer can shutout a Catholic priest every time he opens his mouth if he has spent any amount of time in the Book before dealing with the rascal. The truth is, Keating has to teach Catholic laymen to resort to myth, mental gymnastics, traditions, rumors, forged documents in the first three centuries of church history, casuistry, sophistry, and evasive tactics to handle a soul winner: *not one verse of Scripture appears anywhere in his Roman Catholic tract on “authority”*—NOT ONE VERSE. Not one verse from either Testament. The whole tract is philosophical speculation and “word games” played within a context of asking questions that had nothing to do with ANY verse of Scripture about *anything*. This explains the phenomenon we so often encounter when dealing with Papists and Mariolotars in the Catholic Church. You quote a verse of Scripture and the poor, blind, deluded pagan says, “Oh, that’s just *your* interpretation!”

You didn’t “interpret” anything. You just *quoted* a verse.

Someone, obviously, is not playing the game with a full deck.

Reading a verse, or *quoting* a verse, is interpreting NOTHING; unless, of course, you have a guilt complex (Bibliophobia) about what the verse SAYS because you don't like it or don't agree with it. In that case, you *pretend* the man who read it or quoted it is "interpreting" it because *YOU interpreted it.* This is the Catholic cult's "mentality." It is just as sick as a hippopotamus with chapped lips.

This ends our analysis of San Diego's *"Catholic Answers"* for absolute authority in 1992. Their "final authority" in 1992 is the hierarchy's private interpretations and opinions about what a Christian should believe *instead* of believing the Scriptures. They will ORDER you to believe the private interpretation and, thereby, relieve you of the obligation of searching them (Acts 17:11) to find out what you *should* believe (2 Tim. 2:15). This explains Keating's whole "stratagem" to avoid discussing Scripture by not quoting the Scriptures or allowing the Scriptures to be quoted. This is what Catholic priests train Catholics to do: GET RID OF THE BOOK. At Rome, that has always been SOP, ever since they got their hands on the Book.

Next, we take up *"PROVING INSPIRATION,"* which will wind up where this first tract wound up: 1. The Holy Spirit can interpret nothing apart from the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church will tell you what these interpretations *should be,* even if they contradict EVERYTHING else the Holy Spirit recorded in the Scriptures (see *Rome—The Great Private Interpreter,* 1997).

Proving Inspiration

> "One day the Blessed Virgin Mary said, 'I WILL SAVE THE WORLD with my Rosary and my Scapular.'"
>
> (*The Fatima Crusader,* 1991, p. 24)

This Catholic tract for Catholic converts was written to prove that not only would you be unable to find out how *many* books there should be in the New Testament—after the Roman Catholic Church officially *cursed Jesus Christ* for not lining up with the *wrong number in the Old Testament* (Council of Trent, "anathemas")—unless the Papal hierarchy told you, but you also could not tell if any Book in the Bible was **"given by inspiration"** (2 Tim. 3:16) unless the Papal hierarchy told you.

As you might guess, on six and one-half pages of writing, NOT ONE VERSE OF SCRIPTURE APPEARS. Only one is *referred to* (Acts 8:31), and this was only referred to convince you that the Roman Catholic Church is actually "PHILIP" because she could have solved the "problem for the Ethiopian eunuch" since he needed a "teacher" to help him with Isaiah 53. You are to assume from this that everyone has an unsolvable problem with salvation by grace through faith or a new birth apart from baby sprinkling or the present condition of Mary or the present condition of dead Christians or your lack of statues and images; so only ROME can correctly interpret them for you, since Philip got Isaiah 53 correct. "The same church [Roman] that authenticates the Bible, that establishes its inspiration, is the AUTHORITY set up by Christ to interpret His word."

"WHAT IS YOUR AUTHORITY for saying that?" (To cite the author who wrote both statements; see the previous chapter.)

Not one fool thing on the face of this earth. Keating cannot produce *one Scripture* from either Testament to show that Jesus Christ appointed the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH to be an interpreter of "His word." Keating is on spiritual pot. He had no authority for the statement at all; *he just said it.* Pure speculative *hogwash*. Thirty-one thousand verses in the Book and not ONE said *any church* was given the power to *interpret* ANYTHING.

Now, you must absolutely apply the brakes at this point; pull over to the "incline" and think for a minute. The name of this Roman Catholic tract (in 1991) is "PROVING INSPIRATION." The proof being offered—and in a minute the tractarian will ridicule those who depend on the Holy Spirit to give them proof—is that a pagan church, *found nowhere in either Testament*, proved, from Scripture, that the Scriptures gave it the power to "interpret" a Book *that doesn't mention that cult one time in either Testament*; not even as a religious organization, let alone as an "interpreter" of the Book that doesn't recognize it.

"Mere custom cannot establish the inspiration of the Bible." (After having said this, the Catholics all appeal to *custom* and *tradition* to prove the Immaculate Conception, Purgatory, and prayers for the dead!) "So it is not enough to believe in inspiration of the Bible merely out of culture or HABIT." (*Whereupon, all Catholics lean on Catholic "culture" and Catholic habit to prove the Assumption of Mary and her Perpetual Virginity*. The "infallible" church's decrees on these matters come from CUSTOM and HABIT alone, for, again, neither doctrine is found anywhere in either Testament. Their "authority" was their own opinion, *based on habit and tradition*.)

In all these matters, the cultic material keeps using the words "THE CHURCH," while actually referring to the anti-Biblical private interpretations of leaders in the *Roman* church (see *Rome—The Great Private Interpreter*).

"What about the Bible's own claim to inspiration? If every Biblical book began with the phrase 'The following is an inspired book,' such phrases would prove nothing." To illustrate this, the apologist points out that the *Book of Mormon* and the *Koran* profess to be inspired. They "claim" inspiration.

At this point, the Catholic writer suddenly decides to get off the Interstate at 90 m.p.h. and head for a deer track. In order to get where he is "heading," it is essential for him, at this point, to completely ditch *the Book* he is attacking. He doesn't even give one comparison of *any* verse in the *Koran* or the *Book of Mormon* with *any* verse in the Bible. He led you to think that they were so similar—because they all "claim" inspiration—that there are no intrinsic, internal proofs in sixty-six books of the Holy Bible

that show that it is inspired, whereas the *Koran* and the *Book of Mormon* are NOT.

Here, at the crucial point where the Scriptures prove their own divinity and authority, without Catholic approval, recommendation, or support, all the Catholics "bail out" and *pretend* that any Christian who takes the Book to be inspired without Rome's official approval (plus her official, private interpretations superimposed over it) "is unsatisfied because he knows he has NO GOOD GROUNDS for his belief. The Catholic position is the ONLY ONE that ultimately can satisfy *intellectually."*

Do you get the gist of what has just been said?

Our grounds (the Bible believers) are not *intellectual;* the Roman Catholics' are because they took the word of some *apostate "church" mentioned nowhere in either Testament.* We have no grounds for our belief, but the Catholic does because he took someone's word for it *without checking it out* (see Matt. 23:9; 1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 10:8–12; or Psa. 69:8, for example). This proves he is the "intellectual!" If you take the position of Lorraine Boettner, Martin Luther, John Knox, Dr. M. R. DeHaan, Matthew Henry, John Peter Lange, Adam Clarke, Louis Gaussen, Charles Spurgeon, John Bunyon, Jack Hyles, Dwight Moody, George Whitefield, or Gen. William Booth, you are "dissatisfied with the Bible," but if you take the position of Bloody Mary, Adolph Hitler, Al Capone, Rock Hudson, Vito Genovese, Fidel Castro, Pius XII, Heinrich Himmler, Loyola, Torquemada, Ted Kennedy, and John Paul II, you have the *right position* backed by the *right authority*. This satisfies you "intellectually."

You say, "Where is the Scripture for all of this philosophical casuistry, Brother Ruckman?" You get one guess. It is in 3rd Hezelluia 39:13 and Second Macadams 14:6.

The "Catholic position" on inspiration is anti-Biblical. *It is non-Christian.*

"The multiplicity of interpretations even among fundamentalists should give people a gnawing sense that the Holy Spirit *hasn't been doing His job very effectively"* (see the discussion of this in Chapter One).

But *all Roman Catholics* are "fundamentalists." That is one of the most common and frequent statements to be found in all Catholic apologetics written since 1960. Every Roman Catholic believes in the "fundamentals" as printed by Bob Jones University, and every Roman Catholic, including

ALL those listed above, subscribed to the Apostles' Creed *which contains more in it than can be found in the BJU creed.* All popes are "fundamentalists." They all believe in the Deity of Christ, they all believe in His Virgin Birth, they all subscribe to His literal death, burial, and resurrection, and all of them believe in His Second Coming.

"Multiplicity of interpretations among 'fundamentalists'?" Amen. How about the "gnawing sense" you get when some *pagan idiot* says Mary had only ONE child, after the Holy Spirit, speaking through David, said she had **"children"** (Psa. 69) instead of *cousins* (Luke 1:36) or "nephews" (see Mark 6:3). You talk about a "gnawing sense" regarding the Holy Spirit bungling the job! Man, how did He bungle Hebrews 10:10–14 where He has Christ *sitting down forever, instead of atoning for sins forever* (That was a Catholic edition of the Bible in 1582.).

Hey! You talk about a "gnawing sense that the Holy Spirit hasn't been doing HIS JOB very effectively!" Why, His JOB was to guide and lead you into **"all truth"** (John 16:13)! Would He "guide" you to call a religious leader **"father"** (Matt. 23:9) and then **"Holy Father"** (John 17:11) after reserving those titles for Jesus Christ and God the Father?

If Rome is right, the Holy Spirit not only let you down while He was "on the job," He wasn't even present at the construction site when the whole "furshlunginer" mess collapsed (A.D. 325). How did the "blessed Third Person of the Godhead" get John 6:63 so screwed up that you thought that *eating the corpse of a dead man would affect your SPIRITUAL nature?* How did He get "baptism" into John 3:5 when *the word doesn't appear in one copy of ANY Greek manuscript used for any translation on earth,* and is not only missing in Coptic, Syrian, Gothic, Armenian, Slavic, Georgian, and Ethiopic, but cannot be found in ANY English, French, German, Italian, or Japanese translation on this earth?

"It must be a rare fundamentalist who even for the sake of argument first approaches the Bible as though it were NOT inspired and then upon READING IT syllogistically concludes it IS."

That is exactly what I did as an unsaved sinner, and that is exactly the conclusion I came to after doing it (1949). After reading a book a day since I was ten years old (1931), I approached the Bible as just another book. I found out in less than a week it was not just "another book." Catholics are not Bible READERS. If any of them spent any amount of time READING

the Book they would come to conclusions that would not "jive" with their religious cult. That is why in a discussion of "PROVING INSPIRATION" Keating's tract has gone three pages without yet quoting *one* verse of Scripture in either Testament.

Anyone who read the Book (see John 20:31) and made even the slightest attempt to find out who wrote it (see John 7:17) would find out immediately (John 3:19–20). Varieties of interpretation would come from the fact that:

1. God is the God of individuals (John 1:6; 1 Tim. 5:24–25) and deals *individually* (Prov. 22:2) with *individuals* (Prov. 16:2), who will give account to Him as *individuals* (Rom. 14:12). God will not give the same information to every man on EVERY detail of Scripture, nor should He. Catholics are so non-Biblical they cannot even *discuss* the details, let alone interpret them.

2. Anyone can deviate from an exact truth by *adding* or *subtracting* to the words in Scripture; the most notable example being the Roman Catholic Church herself, *ADDING seven books to the Old Testament canon that weren't even given by the "inspirer" of Scripture.* You talk about a "gnawing sense" of doubt!

3. Anyone can arrive at a variety of interpretations *if they take a verse out of context;* as for example, *all Roman Catholics* remove Matthew 16:16–18 from Matthew 16:23 and *all Roman Catholics* take Acts 2:38 out of context and read it after Acts 16:30.

"In fact, fundamentalists begin with the FACT of inspiration—just as they take other doctrines of fundamentalism as given, not as DEDUCTIONS—and then they find things in the Bible that SEEM to support inspiration, claiming, with circular reasoning, that the Bible confirms its inspiration, which they knew all along."

Now, there is some first-class slander as good as Julius Streicher ever put out on a Jew (1933–1939).

Do you see the statement "they find things in the Bible that SEEM to support inspiration"? Do you know what those things are? *They are computerized, mathematical certainties according to the laws of Statistical Probability as laid down by Heisenberg—an unsaved scientist.* Do you know that we make our "DEDUCTIONS" (see above) on an *intellectual* runway so much faster than where any Pope or priest THINKS, he cannot

even get on the track to warm up his motor? Here is this pagan nut telling you that Fundamentalism can't use DEDUCTION to prove the Bible is inspired while he is going to use deduction to prove the inspiration of Scripture, and then, so help me Mother Teresa, he is going to tell you that if you were *intellectual* and intelligent you would trust *his word* as your final authority after he just confessed that HALF of *his authority* was "HEARSAY"—oral "tradition."

In any Bible, you will find forty-eight prophecies concerning Jesus Christ that were fulfilled to the jot and tittle more than 400 years after they were written. No knowledge is needed to know that the Old Testament was complete before the birth of Christ. Even if you were so liberal you placed Malachi in 50 B.C. you would still have the same problem. How do you prophesy forty-eight details of ANY man's life and death before he is born? Some of the prophecies show up 1,500 years before He is born. The Scriptures authenticate themselves MATHEMATICALLY without any Roman nut investigating anything to draw a judgment about *anything* or tell you what to *believe* or what *not* to believe. Divine inspiration of Scripture is proved by a COMPUTER. The chances of forty-eight prophecies (written 400–1,500 years before a man is born) coming to pass in detail, literally, are one out of ten to the 147th power. That is one out of ten with 147 zeros after the ten; 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. Had enough yet? You're "nowhere daddy-o" (American, circa, 1950). Go on: add 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. Don't stop now! You're over halfway through!

Now, get this and get it straight! These godless, pagan Catholics who are trying to steal God's Book out of your MIND and replace it with the fallible guesses and religious hallucinations of some power-mad fool are telling you that you must accept *their judgments* against the *SCRIPTURE*—apart from what the Scriptures say about themselves—and believe that there is nothing *in the Book* that proves God wrote it. Right in Isaiah 41:22–24 and Isaiah 48:3–8, God Himself told you what PROVED the words were His, and then actually DARED you to put them to the test (Isa. 41:23). Right in 1 Corinthians 2:10, Paul said you could find out Scriptural truths by the Author who dwelt inside your BODY (1 Cor. 6:19) if you were saved (1 Cor. 2:13–14).

In Luke 24:45 you were told *who* would open these Scriptures to you, and it was not any man, woman, or child connected directly, or indirectly, with *any Roman Catholic*, dead or alive, from *any* station or religious rank, in *any* century of man's history. The same thing was confirmed in Genesis 40:8 and confirmed AGAIN in Daniel 2:19, 22. Three witnesses (Deut. 17:6). All three witnesses (Father—Gen. 40; Son—Luke 24:45; and Holy Spirit—Dan. 2, 5) bearing witness to the fact that the inspirer of Holy Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16), and the interpreter of the Holy Scripture (1 Cor. 2:13), is *NOT* THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, or anyone in it between A.D. 325 and A.D. 1992.

"The Catholic method of finding the Bible to be inspired is this: the Bible is first approached as any other ancient work [this is the identical position of Westcott and Hort; it is the approach of an *unsaved sinner* (see above), not a Christian (see Acts 24:14)]. It is not, at first, presumed to be inspired. From TEXTUAL CRITICISM [AHHH!!] WE are able to conclude that WE have a text the accuracy of which is more certain than the accuracy of any other ancient work."

The word "WE," here, means the Alexandrian Cult.

How does the accuracy of the transmission of any text prove INSPIRATION? *It doesn't.*

"A certain text" doesn't HINT at INSPIRATION. The title of this Catholic tract was "PROVING INSPIRATION." The texts of the *Koran* are ten times as consistent as that of the *English* and *Latin* Bibles. The English Bibles vary among themselves more than 90,000 times in FIVE translations: there are 220 available, including five Roman Catholic translations. But accuracy of transmission proves nothing about inspiration of the text *transmitted* or the text it *came from.*

Observe that the Catholics threw out the internal evidence, *which the Scriptures themselves gave as the criteria for proving inspiration* (Isa. 41:22–23) and replaced it with *Humanism*—"textual criticism." When they got through, they had proved nothing except that whatever was first written had been "preserved faithfully." What was written? HE DIDN'T SAY. He didn't cite *one verse* of what had been "preserved accurately." Catholics don't read the Book. *Keating can't even quote it.*

"Not only are the Biblical manuscripts WE have older than those for classical authors [THAT doesn't prove inspiration], WE have in absolute

numbers far more manuscripts to work from [and THAT doesn't prove inspiration]...others are fragments of just a few words [and THAT doesn't prove inspiration], but there are thousands of manuscripts in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Coptic, Syriac, and other languages." *And THAT doesn't prove inspiration.*

The *title* of this Catholic tract was "PROVING INSPIRATION."

He hasn't said *one word* yet that proves *anything* about inspiration. He has just shown you why he thinks you can accept a modern translation of the Bible as "reliable"; because it has a lot of manuscript evidence behind it. *That does not prove any kind of inspiration: it doesn't even deal with inspiration.* It deals with "reliability" of some text that might or might not be inspired.

"Next we take a look at what the Bible, considered merely as a history, tells us, particularly the New Testament, and particularly the Gospels." Why the Gospels? Everything that took place in Matthew 1–27, Mark 1–14, Luke 1–23, and John 1–19 took place UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT LAW. Why would you put the emphasis there and then fail to read what the same Old Testament said about inspiration (Prov. 30:5–6; Job 32:8; Jer. 1:5–9; Ezek. 3:1–10) and interpretation (Gen. 40; Dan. 2, 5)? Strange mentality.

"One thing Jesus said He would do was found a CHURCH [not "Catholic" or "Roman"] and from both the Bible [still taken as merely a history book, not, at this point in the argument, as an inspired one] and other ancient works, we see that Christ established a Church [not "Catholic" or "Roman"] with the rudiments of all we see in the Catholic Church today—papacy, hierarchy, priesthood, sacraments, teaching authority, and, as a consequence OF THE LAST, INFALLIBILITY."

There is no papacy in either Testament.

There are no priests or priesthood in the Body of Christ (Acts 4:36) but individual believers (1 Pet. 2:9).

There are no "sacraments," and no infallibility guaranteed to anything that walks on two feet (Num. 23:19; Rom. 3:4).

Three quarters of the Bible had already been written (see "Bible" above) and had proved itself by *mathematical statistics* to be INSPIRED before Christ rose from the dead. Someone is "giving you the shaft" every time they open their mouth. *You are being brainwashed by a CULT.*

After five pages of this incoherent *nonsense*, the Catholic writer says, "WE have thus taken purely historical material and concluded that there exists a Church [not "Roman" or "Catholic"] which is THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, divinely protected against teaching error." (He means as lately as 1991.)

In two volumes of *Catholicism Against Itself*—using nothing but citations directly from official Roman Catholic publications and publishers—bearing the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic archbishop and the Roman Catholic censor's mark (Nihil Obstat)—you will find where the Roman Catholic Church has not only taught and practised error *continually* through fifteen centuries, but admitted it, and *corrected its own "errors" more than two dozen times by backtracking and denying what it had just taught.* (*Catholicism Against Itself,* O. C. Lambert, 1956, Winfield, Alabama.)

Jesus Christ didn't' say ONE word to *any* Christian on the face of this earth—there were no "Christians" around till several years after His ascension (Acts 11:26)—about any "infallible church" or *any* hierarchy or papacy or *any* "teaching church."

The words "Roman" and "Catholic" (as a church) occur *nowhere* in either Testament in *any* version translated from *any* language on the face of this earth. The "multiplicity" of historical documents (see above) in a dozen languages (see above) ALL fail to mention any "infallible teaching church," any papacy, any "infallible church," any "infallible Roman church," or any "infallible Catholic" church in two centuries after A.D. 90. These are the figments of some politician's *depraved imagination:* he pops up AFTER A.D. 325. He is anti-Scriptural when he pops up.

The Catholic Church has always taught "error," and it is the one thing that you can count on as being absolutely uniform and characteristic. (A good example is this tract on "PROVING INSPIRATION." Look how it winds up.)

"We are not basing the inspiration of the Bible on the Church's infallibility and the Church's infallibility on the word of an inspired Bible. What we have is really a SPIRAL ARGUMENT [as in a tailspin out of control]. On the first level we argue to the reliability of the Bible as history. From that we conclude an INFALLIBLE CHURCH WAS FORMED."

You do? You conclude from HISTORY that an infallible Catholic Church was formed? Do you *read* Church History? Have you read the

church histories by Mosheim, Hefele, Latourette, Glover, Kurtz, Neander, D'Aubigne, Dargan, Schaff, LaGarde, Bettenson, Froom, Newman, Robinson, Leo, and Armitage that deal with that so-called "INFALLIBLE CHURCH" that Christ was supposed to have founded? You "conclude" that a Roman Bachelorhood Hierarchy called a PAPACY is the "INFALLIBLE CHURCH" Christ founded, by "history," do you? "AN infallible church" is no mark of identification; "an" is an *indefinite article.* (See how they do it?)

"WE CONCLUDE that AN infallible church was formed"? Then "WE" are to assume that an *indefinite article* is *"THE* CATHOLIC CHURCH that Jesus Christ founded." (See how it's done?)

If Christ HAD founded "an" infallible church—*which He did not*—it wouldn't be found within 400 miles of Rome in any direction. Rome killed Him. Rome nailed Him after whipping Him. Rome put the spear in His side. Rome decapitated James and Paul and imprisoned Peter and John, and it was Rome that tried to murder Jesus Christ as soon as He was born (Matt. 2). God hasn't given Rome a spiritual revival of any kind for more than 1,800 years. "AN" infallible church, is it? You mean a Corrupt Cult?

"From that [an unidentified, *indefinite article* "church"] we conclude AN infallible church was founded and then we take the word of THAT infallible church that the Bible is inspired: *without the existence of the church* [not "Roman" or "Catholic"] *we could not tell if the Bible were inspired."*

Note! The "WE," above, has *no reference to any saved Bible believer on the face of this earth.* "WE" is a reference to the Catholic membership under the *Roman hierarchy:* THEY could not tell if it were inspired.

The "we" is not a reference to Martin Luther, John Knox, Billy Sunday, John Bunyon, Peter Cartwright, Charles Fuller, Billy Graham, Charles G. Finney, Jonathan Edwards, William Brainerd, W. B. Riley, David Livingston, T. T. Shields, William Carey, Jonathan Goforth, Sam Jones, Frank Norris, or any of their converts. Keating here speaks only for his own kind: **"dead in trespasses and sins,"** and unable to believe Isaiah 38:9–11; Daniel 2:28; Genesis 40:8; and John 16:13 as they stand IN ANY BIBLE.

He took you from "AN infallible church" to "THAT infallible Church" to the ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH without *one Scriptural reference*. This is the pitiful condition that the heathen get into in 1992 when they put the Book down and take up the private interpretations of a *pagan cult.* Note

that, contrary to all news media propaganda (and all the works of the Knights of Columbus), and contrary to Keating's own tracts on the infallibility of the pope, what Rome actually believes is that her entire hierarchy—not just her "shepherd"—is infallible, and this infallibility, far from being limited to an "ex cathedra" statement of a pope (there have been only TWO of these in the last 500 years), is 1,900 years long and applies to *everything* the Roman Catholic Church has taught, at any time, in those nineteen centuries. "TAKE THE WORD OF THAT INFALLIBLE *CHURCH"* is the quotation in "PROVING INSPIRATION," written in 1991.

That is the "church" that officially cursed Jesus Christ in the Council of Trent (A.D. 1546) by declaring that anyone who did not accept *Maccabees* and *Tobit* and *Ecclesiasticus* as inspired literature was "ANATHEMA" (i.e. CURSED). **"No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus Christ accursed"** (1 Cor. 12:3).

You are to believe this godless word of "testimony" and confess that without this godless word of "testimony" *you* couldn't find out if the Scriptures were inspired (see above). You are to do this after seeing, by reading the Book—they just said that is how they arrived at their conclusions—that the Holy Spirit *wrote* the Book (2 Tim. 3:16), *interpreted* the Book (John 14:17, 16:13, 1 Cor. 2:10–12), *indwells the believer* who is saved by believing the Book (James 1:21; 1 Pet. 1:25), instead of men (1 Thess. 2:13); and seeing also that if any long-robed, religious hypocrite (Luke 20:46, Matt. 23:9) called **"father"** (Matt. 23:9) taught anything contrary to those words (John 8:40–48; Prov. 30:5–6) HE WAS A LIAR (John 8:44; Rev. 2:2).

Isn't that asking just a little too much for any "intellectual" for one day?

"The Catholic believes in inspiration because THE CHURCH [not "Roman" or "Catholic" in any Bible] tells him so, and the same Church [not "Roman" or "Catholic" in any New Testament epistle] has the authority to INTERPRET THE INSPIRED TEXT. Fundamentalists believe in inspiration, though on WEAK GROUNDS, for they have no INTERPRETING AUTHORITY other than *themselves."*

Now, this mental sickness is called "Road Runner in Disneyworld" or "Mario! Bugs Bunny is about to get you!"

Our (the Bible believers) "weak grounds" are *the words that are settled forever in Heaven* (Psa. 119:89) and will be there when Heaven and Earth pass away (Matt. 24:35). Our "weak grounds" are *the words that brought creation into existence* (Psa. 119:160; Heb. 11:3) and live and abide, surviving all Popes (1 Pet. 1:25). Our "weak grounds" are so *living* they can search *a man's heart* (Heb. 4:12–13) and *condemn him* at the last judgment (John 12:48). Those are our "weak grounds."

The Catholic has "strong grounds." What are they? The *opinions* of a wine-headed bachelor priesthood whose teachings have *contradicted the words of the Holy Spirit so many times* (1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 10:10–14; Psa. 69:8; Matt. 23:9; John 6:63; Acts 4:12; Isa. 66:2; Rev. 12:1–3) as to be absolutely *comical.*

Our "interpreting authority" (see above) is the One who wrote the Book (Luke 24:45; John 14:26; 1 Corinthians 2:10) while the poor Papist's "interpreting authority" is a bunch of *pagan sinners* who couldn't even find the verses *in their own Bibles* that showed *who* the interpreting authority was! By delivering their consciences and their minds to a hierarchy of Bible-correcting pagans, these poor souls abandoned the Author of Scripture and rejected HIS "interpreting authority." They replaced it with a hierarchy of pagan Papists whose track record would make Judas Iscariot blush for shame.

So ends the Catholic tract of "PROVING INSPIRATION" (P.O. Box 17181, San Diego, CA 92117). *"This is the Catholic Church"* in A.D. 1992.

You never read a more honest confession. The *final authority* for a Catholic is not the Scripture at all; it is *what* the Vatican hierarchy *thinks* about the Scripture, and without them to tell him what to think (see above) the Catholic really cannot find out the first, main, and plainest truth in the Book: **"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable . . ."** (2 Tim. 3:16).

This explains why Catholics have never been, and will never be, *Bible readers.* They may look up a verse or two occasionally or run through a few verses when teaching the private interpretations of the Popes, but they do not READ the BOOK. The ones who begin to read it, and stay in it, always *leave the Catholic Church* and get into "the church that Christ founded." See 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4–5.

God's *word* and God's *words* authenticate themselves (John 7:17). This can be proven MATHEMATICALLY as well as spiritually and practically (1 Thess. 2:13). But this automatically does away with any nebulous, ethereal, nonexistent "infallible teaching authority" that never had any more substance to it from the first day that it cut Mark 16:9–20 and Hebrews 10:10–14 out of its Biblical manuscripts (B, Vaticanus) till now, than Winnie the Pooh or Calvin and Hobbes. Rome doesn't stop at claiming infallibility when it comes to Biblical interpretation; it also claims the right to dictate foreign and domestic policies to every ruler, king, president, ambassador, dictator, prince, chairman, and senator on the face of this earth (see Avro Manhattan, *Vatican Imperialism in the Twentieth Century,* 1965).

How do you "PROVE INSPIRATION?"

You come to the Book and submerge yourself in it day and night (Psa. 1:1–3) and *memorize* it (Psa. 119:11). You *pray* as you *study* it for God to help you not only to believe it but to understand it. How do you prove inspiration? *You put the Book to the test.* You try it out to see if it "works" (pragmatism). You claim its promises, apply its principles, obey its instructions, and then if you can't find out it is "INSPIRED" go back to the Catholic Church and rejoin the pagans, whose only hope is taking the word of some deceived *idiot* who wants people to think that he and his church are "infallible teaching authorities."

Was Peter in Rome?

"In this sheepfold of Jesus Christ, no one can enter if not under the guidance of the SUPREME PONTIFF, and men can be certain to achieve SALVATION ONLY IF THEY ARE UNITED TO HIM, since the ROMAN Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ and represents HIS PERSON on earth."

(Pope John XXIII—Vatican II—
when being crowned at his "coronation," 1958.
The World of the Vatican, Robert Neville,
Harper and Row, 1962, p. 119)

Well, if he was, Paul really treated him like dirt. Before his execution, Paul saluted *a dozen Christians* and forgot to *mention* the Prince of Apostles and "Vicar of Christ" (2 Tim. 4). But it wasn't the first time Paul slighted "the bishop." Paul was in the habit of greeting all of Peter's church members, while ignoring their pastor (Rom. 16), which you will have to admit is pretty unethical when supposedly believing that the pastor is "THE SUPREME PONTIFF"!

Writing to the First Catholic Church at Rome (Rom. 16) and saluting Andronicus, Junia, Urbane, Amplias, Stachyus, Apollos, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Hermas, Patrobas, Nereus, Persis, Rufas, and Hermes, while forgetting to say "Hello" to their pastor! Why Paul didn't even mention their pastor's *name*! What an unforgivable oversight in view of the fact that Simon Peter was the "PRINCE of apostles," the VICAR of Christ, the "Shepherd of the Sheep" entrusted with "teaching authority"!

My stars what a bummer. Here is old Eusebius (A.D. 303) and Dionysisus (A.D. 170) and Tertullian (A.D. 200) and Lactantius, plus Clement of Rome and Ignatius (a forged epistle!) and Irenaeus (A.D. 190), all repeating Cyprian's fable about Peter being in Rome, with a New Testament right before them—the Church fathers quote Scripture 35,000 times in their combined writings—where Peter is supposed to have been in Rome in A.D. 58 when he wrote 1 Peter 5:13, and, lo and behold, Paul says

(in A.D. 60) that Rome was *virgin territory* (Rom. 15:20) where NO ONE HAD YET PREACHED THE GOSPEL (Rom. 15:21).

Now, think about this for a while. Notice how the Holy Scriptures always contradict this presumptuous, "infallible *teaching"* church as it turns to SINNERS (after the New Testament was completed) to *DENY* WHAT IS FOUND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Did you get that? Not one man named above was spreading this cockeyed, anti-Scriptural nonsense until 100–150 years *after* Paul was beheaded. Paul refused to recognize Simon Peter as being within 500 miles of Rome at ANY time between A.D. 33 and A.D. 68. He mentions Simon Peter when Simon is somewhere else (note Gal. 2). *Simon is not "there" when Paul wrote to Rome, either before Paul got there* (Rom. 15:20–21) *or AFTER he got there* (2 Tim. 4:10–21).

Now, guess what the good, old, "infallible teaching church that Christ founded" is going to do? Can't you guess? Catholics aren't Bible readers. They don't even know what Romans 15–16 is about.

So here is Karl Keating's opportunity to deceive the unwary again. Having taken their infallible source of authority from them (see the last chapter) this should be a "snap." No Catholic would consider why Paul (about to be executed in Peter's "diocese") would fail to mention Peter. They don't read the Book long enough to think about such things. Be sure that Keating and the tractarians will take advantage of this typical Catholic ignorance of the Scriptures.

"If the papacy exists *it was established by Christ during His lifetime*, long before Peter is said to have reached Rome. There *must have been* a period of some years in which the papacy had no connection with Rome."

I'll tell you one better than that. There is no "papacy" during the life of Christ, the death of Christ, or for that matter, fifty-seven years of apostolic Christianity after His ascension: that is HISTORY as well as BIBLE. There has *always* "been a time" when the papacy was not connected with anything Scriptural *in either Testament* and is to no more be associated with the Lord Jesus Christ than the Mafia or Hollywood's "Rat pack."

The word "PAPACY" was invented by Papists to describe a bachelor priesthood at Rome that usurped the Old Testament Levitical priesthood, producing a Nicolaitan class that is found *nowhere* in the New Testament. John writes in A.D. 90. In A.D. 90 no Christian anywhere on the face of God's earth would think of being connected with a "papacy" of a "Vatican"

anymore than being connected with Nero or Domitian. The "papacy" was patterned after the Roman Imperial Government (*The History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. I, p. 50), and it finds no counterpart in *any* universal church or *any* local church found *anywhere* in either Testament. "A period of *some years,"* is it? Yes, a rough estimate would have to make it about *400 years*, since no Roman bishop was called a "pope" till long after the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), and the word "PAPACY" ("paps," "papa," "pope") comes from PAPISTS, not Christians.

Now, you are told that the only reason that Bible-believing Christians do not believe Peter was in Rome is "because they think they can get mileage out of it." How did Keating come to this ridiculous conclusion? By avoiding discussing Romans 15:20–21 and 2 Timothy 4:16–21. "If people conclude the Catholic Church is wrong on this historical point they'll conclude it is wrong on the larger one [good thinking], the supposed existence of the papacy. Such is the real reasoning of leading anti-Catholics."

Guess again. Our "real reason" (or "only reason"—see above) is *because Paul, James, and John refuse to recognize Peter as ever having been in Rome before or after he (Paul) got there.* Furthermore, Paul doesn't mention Peter as having been there *after he came and left Rome,* following his first imprisonment (see Philippians and 1–2 Timothy).

No one is concerned about "gaining mileage" by denying a pipe dream. What we are interested in is *facts*. The Apostle to the Romans (Rom. 15:8–16), who was sent to Rome to set up a church at Rome, *deliberately refused to mention Peter's name or Peter as having been in Rome one time in sixty years.* That is what "interests" the person who READS the Bible instead of Lactantius, Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, Ignatius, and other unreliable "authorities."

Keating was just taking advantage of your ignorance. SOP in the Vatican. They operate in 1992 just like they did in 1292.

"Admittedly the Scriptural evidence for Peter being in Rome is weak. Nowhere does the Bible unequivocally say he was there [IT SAYS *PAUL* WAS THERE]; on the other hand, it doesn't say *he wasn't."* Hold it, man. Let's have fifteen more "hands." What do you mean "on the other hand" it doesn't say he *wasn't* (in Rome)? Why, bless my soul, it doesn't say he wasn't in *Moscow;* it doesn't say he wasn't in *Tokyo;* it doesn't say he

wasn't in Athens; it doesn't say he wasn't in *Paris;* it doesn't say he wasn't in *Oklahoma City;* and it doesn't say he wasn't in the *French Quarter.* What do you mean "on the other hand"? *It says the Apostle to Rome, who wrote to the Romans, was in Rome* (2 Tim. 1:17; Phil. 4:22).

Like I said to a Water Dog one time (that's a "Campbellite"): "It doesn't *say* Simon Peter didn't shoot his mother-in-law with a 45 caliber pistol, so he must have!"

Now, the "scriptural proof" that Peter was in Rome BEFORE Paul got there is that Eusebius (in 303) insisted that the word **"Babylon"** in 1 Peter was *not* a reference to Babylon. It was a "code word" for Rome (*The Apocalypse of Baruch,* ii:1 and 4 Esdras 3:1 and *The Sibylline Oracles* 5: 159f). You are to believe this when Paul says **"Rome"** (as in Rome) over and over again (Rom. 1:7, 15) without any use of a "code word" at all. But to surpass the bounds of lunacy, you are now told that the city of Rome will fall as Babylon fell in Revelation 18:21 because that **"Babylon"** was Rome. This is done by ALLEGORIZING and SPIRITUALIZING Revelation 18:8, 14, 16 and 18–19, 24, *which had no application to ancient Rome at all.* All those verses are privately interpreted to make them fit the Papal system. The symbols of Revelation have no connection with the *ancient* city of Rome at all; they are the symbols used *today* (1991) by the Catholic Church (gold, silver, precious stones, scarlet, purple, golden cup, etc.). The symbol of the *ancient city* of Rome, in Peter and Paul's day, was an EAGLE.

"These references cannot be to the one time capital of the Babylonian Empire. That Babylon has been reduced to an inconsequential status by the march of years, military defeat, and political subjugation; it was no longer a great city."

First Peter says nothing about a "GREAT" city. The **"Babylon"** Peter is writing from is NOT the **"Babylon"** John wrote about. Error again. Error, after error, after error, coming from the "infallible teaching church." Peter is at Babylon, as in **"Babylon."** It *was* a city in his time; it *did* contain Gentile and Jewish converts (1 Pet. 4:3, 2:3). The Babylon John writes about cannot be ancient Rome at all, for John **"wondered with great admiration"** when he sees that **"Babylon"** drunken with the "blood of the martyrs and saints" (17:6). Why would John marvel over that if it was ancient Rome? He was being persecuted by *ancient Rome* when he wrote the Book!

You see, "the teaching church" is not even a *student* of the Scriptures. They never learned enough Scripture to teach anyone anything.

"Peter was known TO THE AUTHORITIES as the leader of the church (at Rome) and the church [never "Roman" or "Catholic"] under Roman laws was organized atheism. Peter was a wanted man. Why encourage a man hunt?"

Peter was "known" by the AUTHORITIES at Rome as the leader of THE church, but was not known by PAUL as a leader of any church in Rome? *Paul doesn't recognize Peter as even a CHURCH MEMBER of the church in Rome* (Rom. 16). Have the Papists lost their minds? Yessiree Bob (American, circa 1920), they sure have!

Paul faced off with Peter and rebuked him for teaching ERROR (Gal. 2) after the Lord commissioned Peter to "feed His sheep" (John 21). Paul *knew Peter* and visited with him *two weeks* (Gal 2) and had fellowship with him at the council in Jerusalem (Acts 15), but then refused to *send him greetings after he founded the church in Rome?* And then forgot to mention that he was *the pastor* there, who died where he (Paul) was about to die? And all of this with "Blessed Simon Peter" being given "two swords" and the "keys to the Kingdom" and becoming the "rock" on which the one *true church* was founded? How in the world did the Apostle to Rome and the Romans miss all of this? According to Eusebius, Irenaeus, Lactantius, Clement, and Ignatius (forged epistle!), he did.

Dionysius of Corinth says that "Peter and Paul planted the church at Rome." They did? *When?* Paul got there *before* Peter did, and when he got there, via shipwreck, Pete was not with him; Luke was (Acts 27–28).

Catholics don't read the Bible.

Peter had not touched foot in Italy in A.D. 60 when Paul got there (Rom. 15:20), and he didn't show up *after* Paul left (A.D. 62), and was not even there when Paul *returned* in A.D. 68 to be beheaded (2 Tim. 4). "Peter and Paul planted the church in Rome," did they? No, son, you got it twisted. *Demas and Mary Magdalene planted the church in Rome.*

"Fundamentalists admit Paul died in Rome, so the IMPLICATION from Tertullian [not Scripture] is that Peter also MUST have been there."

Well no, not unless you think the opinion of a Bible corrector in A.D. 200 tells more truth than the Holy Spirit did in Romans 15:20–21, 16:1–22; Gal. 2:1–12; and Acts 27–28 before A.D. 70.

The final "proof" that Simon Peter was at a city that he never got within 800 miles of is that "excavations," in 1962, proved that Peter was buried underneath the altar at St. Peters. This, after excavations near *Bethany*, produced Peter's coffin with his name on it (*The History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. I, p. 158). The spurious work proving that Peter was buried in Rome is a Roman Catholic publication called *The Bones of St. Peter* by John Walsh. The "scientific evidence" that proved this was Peter's body was so nonexistent that the tractarian ("Was Peter in Rome?") dispenses with ALL the "evidence" and everything in the book and claims, rather, that "his remains were *apparently* present" because Roman Catholic inscriptions near the tomb, by Roman Catholics, "identified" the place as Peter's burial place.

"It is enough to say that the combination of historical [*ignoring the Scripture*] and scientific evidence [*ignoring Scripture*] is such that no one willing to look at the FACTS [*ignoring every verse listed in this chapter*] with an open mind can doubt Peter was in Rome. To deny that FACT [*which contradicts the Scripture*] is to let PREJUDICE override reason [*apart from Scriptures*]."

There it is. You are "prejudiced" if you don't close your mind to Romans, Galatians, 2 Timothy 4, and Acts and open it to a cliqué of Bible-rejecting "church fathers" who simply ape a party line passed down to them from ONE MAN (*The History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. I, p. 62) who did not read his Bible, or if he did, he didn't believe it. Infidelity is infectious; it spreads like a plague.

There is as much evidence that Peter was in Rome as there is that he was in downtown Philadelphia. Pure, unfounded, anti-Biblical GOSSIP is the source of Rome's dogma on this point. *What happened to Peter's wife?* He was married and took her with him when he went out to preach (see 1 Cor. 9:5 and Matt. 8:14). Why could you find Peter's grave and not Paul's when BOTH of them "planted the church in Rome"? Why wasn't Paul buried next to Peter if *both of them* "planted the church in Rome"?

Do you mean to tell me that "Christians" couldn't have located *Paul's grave* in 1,900 years and dug up his corpse and planted it next to Peter's, or vice versa? *How come "the early Christians" knew where Peter's grave was but couldn't locate the grave of the apostle who brought them the*

gospel for the first time, before hide-nor-hair of Peter showed up (Rom. 15:20–21) *and wrote the only epistle in the New Testament aimed at them?*

You talk about "reason" and "prejudice"!

You talk about Bugs Bunny in Wonderland!

You talk about "historical and scientific evidence"!

That is Rome, the great private interpreter. That is Rome, not in A.D. 1000 or 1400 but in *1992.* This is late twentieth-century Biblical corruption spelled "D-A-M-N-A-T-I-O-N." This is *Catholic Answers,* from San Diego, designed for lost and saved suckers who will not READ their Bibles. "Was Peter in Rome?" No, he went to Russia where they dubbed him "Peter the Great," and to deny the "historical" and "scientific" evidence for *that* shows you are a "prejudiced bigot." (But you'll still be ahead of anyone, *intellectually*, who thinks he got to Rome!)

Can You Swallow God?

> "If ANYONE deny that in the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially, the BODY AND BLOOD together with the SOUL AND DIVINITY of our LORD Jesus Christ, LET HIM BE ACCURSED."
>
> (*The Fatima Crusader,* 1991, p. 21)

The fountain from which all Roman Catholic corruption comes from, in any century, is the same source, the same spring. This river of non-Biblical corruption which streams through the centuries is a source of all Biblical pollution and religious corruption on seven continents.

Back of all Vatican politics, compromises with Fascism and Nazism, the Mafia, the Cosa Nostra, Torquemada, the infamous Kennedy family, Bloody Mary, the international drug traffic, the Spanish Armada, both World Wars, Vietnam, the Inquisition, and the destruction of France, Spain, Poland, Italy, Germany, Mexico, and South America, lies a RELIGIOUS PROFESSION that *professes* to be allied to the gospel: the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

It is the Pope's profession of "Christianity" that is his "ace in the hole." It is his ability to *pretend* to be a State on one occasion, while claiming the political and diplomatic immunity and privileges of a Church on the other hand (dual authorities: Alexandrian Cult, etc.) that enables his hierarchy to avoid **"the gates of hell"** and guide the Catholic Church safely through 1,500 years of opposition from other secular and religious leaders. Rome survives because she is willing to make ANY compromise, or any adjustment, to any philosophy, religion, political system, or news media position, in order to retain her own POWER and AUTHORITY.

By now (see the first two chapters) that should be evident. She professes that SHE is the absolute and final authority for *everything God ever revealed to any man on the face of this earth,* and she alone has the power and authority to interpret that revelation.

From whence did this omnipotent Bible perverter get her strength? What is the BASIC and fundamental doctrine that she depends upon to

"carry on" like she does? Well, the heart and soul of Roman Catholicism (found nowhere in either Testament in *any* version of *any* translation) is what Catholic pagans call "THE MASS." The word is a non-Biblical word and the nearest thing to it is the "dismissal" (note "missal") of a convocation in Acts 19:41 where a bunch of *pagans* had been worshipping a *female goddess* (Acts 19:34–35).

Note also how the NIV, ASV, NASV, and the NKJV neatly covered up for these dolly worshippers by converting **"churches"** (*AV* in all editions) into "TEMPLES," to line their Bibles up with the *RSV, NRSV, NEB*, and other counterfeit Bibles.

The "Mass" is the most convenient formal piece of routine liturgy you ever saw, because the entire service can be reduced to *five minutes* or lengthened to *two hours,* depending upon the "crowd." If the dolly worshippers need to get off to the beach in the morning to strut their flesh, the "Mass" can be reduced to a fifteen minute, legalistic ritual, before 9 a.m., so they can worship the sun. If a cake-eater is dying, there can be an emergency "taking of the wafer" reduced to a matter of seconds.

"Sermons" do not enter American Catholic churches until the time of Billy Graham. Till then, they were simply talks or *announcements*. Catholics in America only began to adopt Protestant methods around 1950, and among them they even picked up Sunday Schools and Daily Vacation Bible Schools. I have clippings where they even sent their priests to Southern Baptist schools to learn how to "preach," and on several occasions entered Baptist pulpits to preach on "JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH."

That was the theme of Luther's German Reformation.

No Catholic believes in justification by faith, in the sense of Romans 4:5 and Hebrews 10:10–12. No Catholic is totally clean of all his sins at death, and if the hierarchy arbitrarily decides he (or she) was, in order to make a "saint" out of him, it is done on the basis of political expediency and *sentimental guesswork.*

If anyone thinks I am slandering anyone, let him write to *Catholic Answers* (we have given the full address twice already in this book) and ask for the tract on "PURGATORY." No one slandered anyone. David is the illustration used for punishment in purgatory. If David wasn't more of a "saint" than Thomas Aquinas or Ignatius Loyola, you can play ping-pong on the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico.

This “adjustment” to the ministry of Billy Graham (1950–1980) had to be made because his ministry was worldwide and Billy would “cooperate” with the priests and nuns.

When Billy retired in 1991, he retired in good favor (and in good standing) with every Pope since Pope Pius XII—Hitler’s buddy—up to John Paul II. The Popes never criticized Graham for ANYTHING. Neither did the news media. How different was their attitude toward J. Frank Norris, T. T. Shields, John R. Stratton, and W. B. Riley, whom they called “The Four Horsemen of the Devil.” How differently the popes responded to John Knox, Martin Luther, William Tyndale, John Huss, and John Wycliffe!

The first set are from the twentieth century and the second set are from the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries, but Billy Graham is entirely unique. Rome has always responded to *real Biblical preaching* as they responded to the preaching of the *Reformers*. It is not until 1950 that a Protestant “evangelist” shows up whom they can “go along with” and brag about. No man on earth had such a universal appeal to Catholics, Communists, Jews, blacks, politicians, journalists, newscasters, unsaved Liberals and Modernists, Conservatives and Evangelicals, Charismatics and Bible revisors as Billy Graham.

Now, the heart of Roman Catholicism is *one legalistic ritual;* a symbolic play, acted out every Sunday morning in the same manner, worldwide. This pagan ritual is called a “SACRIFICE.” It is called “THE SACRIFICE of the Mass” in every piece of literature ever printed by any Roman Catholic priest, Bishop, Archbishop, layman, nun, “saint,” or “doctor” who ever lived.

The “Mass” is the source and root of religious corruption that has damned Western civilization for more than 1,500 years. And the reason for this will be evident as we examine Catholic corruption in the late twentieth century—AFTER “Vatican II” (Don’t forget *that!*)—exactly as this corruption destroyed Biblical Christianity in every nation on earth for fifteen centuries preceding it.

In what is about to follow, keep one thing in mind: the Catholics profession to have an infallible “teaching church”—an infallible teacher who can INTERPRET any passage in the Bible to mean anything the hierarchy wants it to mean. *That* is the key. No Catholic on earth is allowed to read what is about to follow and make up his own mind about what

Biblical interpretation is and what it is not. The Catholics here (in this case, the Knights of Columbus) give out with the private interpretation of *their own hierarchy* and, in so doing, successfully produce an anti-Christian, non-Biblical "sacrifice" that demands its adherent to *DENY his sanity.* This will be apparent (literally) in what follows. You must give up your MIND, as well as your conscience, when you follow this blind bunch of blind guides into **"the ditch"** (Matt. 15:14).

This "Mass" is the crux of Catholic corruption. It was the excuse used by the Papists for 1,000 years (700–1700) to murder and torture Bible-believing "heretics." If you purchase *The Bloody Theatre* (available at the Bible Baptist Bookstore), you will find more than 300 regular-sized pages of material that deal with inquisitions between Catholic bishops and martyrs before the martyr was "racked" or burned at the stake, or both.

In everyone of these conversations, the chief theme of discussion, and the point of controversy, is *"Do you actually believe that when you swallow the wafer that you swallow the Second Person of the Godhead?".* It is not enough for the victim to confess that "Christ is present in the Mass." He must believe that the FULL DIVINITY and the FULL DEITY of Christ is IN the wafer; not just *alongside it* or *concurrent with it* or "present *at that time."*

I have studied two dozen of these lengthy inquisitions: *everyone of them is identical.* The Bible believer is to be beheaded or burned at the stake if he does not believe that a wafer in a Catholic church can be turned into the *Second Person of the Godhead.*

Now, let us step out of the bloody twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and pretend—as all Catholics do—that is was just the "spirit of the times" that brought about the murder of 25,000 Greek Orthodox Serbians in 1942 (!!) and the slaughter of Protestant missionaries in Columbia in 1960–1961 (!!). Let us get up into the end of the twentieth century to see how the Catholics have "changed" since "Vatican II" (a news media line). Here (in 1992) is the *official position* and official teaching of *every Roman Catholic Archbishop, Cardinal, and Pope who ever lived since A.D. 500, as it appears in 1992.*

"Thus the CROSS, the Last Supper and the [Roman Catholic] Mass are *one* and the *same* sacrifice. These three SACRIFICES have the *same* VICTIM and the same PRIEST (!) and the *same* offering."

Now, are you ready to abandon your sanity? "The same PRIEST," is *holding up a Catholic wafer* when the ONE HIGH PRIEST (Heb. 4:14), whom we have, *is seated at the right hand of God* (Heb. 7:26), and came from the tribe of Judah (Heb. 7:13–14)? Yes, if you just break your glasses, close your eyes, and throw your Bible out the window. "The same priest," when our priest is **"holy, harmless, undefiled"** (Heb. 7:26) **"and made higher than the heavens"** and not like a priest who can never take away anyone's sins by offering sacrifices for sins (Heb. 5:1, 10:11)? "The same priest," when our Priest was *not* a child molester, did *not* embezzle church funds, did *not* lead armed troops out to kill professing Christians, and *wore the common, ordinary, everyday clothing of His day and time?*

"These three sacrifices have...THE SAME PRIEST" (pp. 11–12, Knights of Columbus, *The Mass, the Eternal Sacrifice*). Then Gen. George Patton and Cassius Clay are identical.

But this anti-Christian, non-Biblical madness does not stop here. Observe: "Wherever the last supper is REPRODUCED by those whom He appointed to do so, IT IS THE *SAME* SACRIFICE." You are to believe this. You are to believe it under pain of being CURSED (anathema), for the Council of Trent said if any man (ANYONE) didn't believe what you just read, he was "anathema." Do you know why you would be cursed? Because you made the mistake of noticing that:

1. *At Calvary, the "PRIESTS" are mocking Jesus Christ.* (Do they do that Sunday morning at the "Mass"?)
2. Priests called **"father"** (Matt. 23:9) are among *His murderers.*
3. The sacrifice of the cross is *bloody* with blood being shed, and the warning that if any sacrifice is not BLOODY, where blood is shed, it is totally *ineffectual* (Heb. 9:22).
4. The sacrifice of the Cross is said to be ONCE and **"for all,"** and once **"for ever"** (Heb. 10:10–12). *The whole passage is missing from Vaticanus (manuscript B) which is the Vatican.*
5. At the Mass, the literal, physical "victim" is not present, for the "victim" is a glorified Christ seated in the third heaven (Heb. 3:1–4, 8:1).
6. In the "Mass" no blood can be produced, *for the risen Saviour had NO BLOOD in His body (see 1 Cor. 15:50; John 19:34).*

The cross, the Lord's Supper, and the Mass are the "same"?

7. At the Lord's Supper, Jesus Christ spoke in the common language His disciples spoke in. For 1,800 years, the Mass was spoken in ONE tongue that no German, Frenchman, Englishman, Spaniard, Irishman, Russian, Polack, or Hungarian spoke in.

8. In the Lord's Supper our Lord is FACING His disciples: the Baalite Mass is said with the "priest" giving you his BACKSIDE.

9. Jesus said: **"This is my blood of the new testament,"** but every pagan priest of Baal, who made a liar out of Him, says, "This is the chalice of my blood of the New and eternal Testament MYSTERY OF FAITH."

10. Jesus broke the bread BEFORE He said, **"This is my body."** The pagan Baalites pronounce the words BEFORE they break the bread.

11. Jesus Christ doesn't say one word about the bread or the new wine being offered to God as a "SACRIFICE"; *not a word.* But the old long-robed "father" says *"a sacrifice* for the sins of the quick and the dead."

12. Whereas, the Lord Jesus says **"This do in remembrance of me,"** the old Catholic blasphemer—just as pious as Mother Teresa and Pope John Paul II—says "Solemnizing and communicating in THE FIRST PLACE the remembrance of THE GLORIOUS MARY, *ever Virgin."*

And the "Mass" and the Lord's Supper are the SAME, are they?

Well, if you are a two-faced, lying, religious *hypocrite* trying to cover up *your dirty, rotten sin* of rejecting the Holy Bible, "Yes." You cannot con a man unless he is crooked. Anyone who could be "conned" by the Knights of Columbus into believing that the Cross, the Lord's Supper, and the Mass are "the SAME sacrifice" would have to be so crooked they would have to screw their socks on in the morning.

"The *Holy* Synod [!] teaches that this sacrifice [the Mass] is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy and find grace...the only *difference* between the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of Calvary is that on the cross *Christ's BLOOD was actually shed* [see above!]: whereas in the Mass, we have a MEMORIAL SACRIFICE in which the shedding of blood is *represented"* (ibid., pp. 13–14).

Thus, we finally arrive at the terminus that any insane person would arrive at, understanding, of course, that Catholics are not insane when it comes to art, music, education, politics, science, raising families, participating in sports, or making a living. They are only "out of their

skulls" in ONE department: *the New Testament*. When the New Testament shows up, they go just as nutty as a pecan pie. Here is the dead end into which Keating and the Knights of Columbus lead anyone who was stupid enough to think that the Catholic Church has more authority than the Book.

"In the Mass one receives the *VERY* BODY and *VERY* BLOOD of Jesus Christ...in an UNBLOODY manner" (Morrow, *My Catholic Faith,* p. 284ff, John O'Brien, *The Faith of Millions,* p. 382, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,* Knights of Columbus, pamphlet no. 6, pp. 28–29).

Got it?

"*UNBLOODY BLOOD."*

"There is nothing in the Eucharist but the flesh and *BLOOD of Christ*...although the figures of bread and wine remain." That is, you pretend the figure is REAL while you are pretending that the *real* is only a FIGURE. To attain this fantastic excursion into "cloudland," the Catholic Church had to dissect John 6 and remove John 6:52, 54 from its context and then get rid of John 6:63 as the key to interpreting the context. (See the video made back in 1988 with Karl Keating and observe how he tried to alter John 6:63 so it would have no application to the context of John 6:52).

Observe again, the peculiar Satanic delusions that can be produced by DUAL authorities. Note the words "ROMAN CATHOLIC," for example (as well as "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE," "Grape Nuts," and "Unbloody Blood").

Grape Nuts are not nuts nor do they contain grapes. Christian Science is anti-Christian, and it is not scientific.

"Catholic" means universal, not "Roman." Rome is *one city* in *one country* on *one continent;* there are about 4,000,000 others. If it is "Roman" it is NOT "universal," and if it is "universal" it *cannot* be "Roman." If the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice of Calvary are the same, with the literal *BLOOD of Christ* showing up in the Mass (see above), it cannot be an "UNBLOODY" sacrifice. If it is a *sacrifice*, blood is shed (see Heb. 9–10). If no blood is shed, it is only a *spiritual sacrifice* (see 1 Pet. 2:5; Heb. 13:16), and no literal blood is present.

The Catholic Mass, *by definition of those who invented it and fabricated it out of sheer black magic,* is the teaching that a legalistic ritual Sunday morning by a counterfeit priest is IDENTICAL with the Lord's Supper in the upper room and with Calvary's sacrifice on Golgotha, although two of

them are *unbloody* with no blood being shed for anyone to "DRINK," and in *two of them* Christ's physical body is NOT divided into wafers *nor does anyone get eternal life* (see John 6:54) *by EATING His literal body.*

But all three are "one and the same sacrifice."

They are if you are off your "rocker" a mile and a half.

You must *"represent* the shedding of blood" without *shedding it,* and then pretend that it is THREE—having been "sacrificed"—*although it is not being shed.* The only way you could do this would be to pretend that Christ did NOT shed His blood, but that He still had it IN HIM, so when He "shows up under the appearance" of fermented liquor (from Christian Brothers Distillery) *He brings back what He shed, BEFORE He shed it* (as in the Lord's Supper). That is, you manufacture bootleg blood out of bootleg liquor (all Catholic priests used *fermented liquor* clear through the Prohibition era), and pretend that this is the *same blood* Jesus Christ *shed*, when he made a once-for-all, once-forever, eternal atonement for sins that PURGED every believer from every sin he committed from Adam to Eternity (Heb. 1:3). *Purging of sins in the Bible is never connected with anyone burning anywhere.* It is Christ's PAST, one, final, eternal, effectual, bloody atonement that PURGES (Heb. 9:14, 21).

But that is not what the "infallible teaching church" teaches: that is what the New Testament SAYS. And we have been at this business long enough now to know where the Book says one thing and the "infallible interpreter of Scripture" denies it, you are to follow the "infallible teacher" without whose opinion (see p. 32–33) you wouldn't even know the Book was inspired.

You do and you will wind up with your "fathers" in John 8:40–44.

You do and you will wind up with the "fathers" in Matthew 23:33 and Mark 9:42, 44.

You do and you will make the final (and most tragic) error you ever made since you drew a breath of air on this planet. The Catholic Mass in 1992 is the very heart of *Biblical corruption*. It brings the lost sinner up to the very threshold of salvation (the *sacrificial* death of Jesus Christ, atoning for the sinner's sins, and taking away **"the sin of the world"**) and then, at the last minute, it sets Jesus Christ out of his reach, inserts "MARY" (*see the Mass above*) and offers the proselyte a WAFER GOD that he can eat and digest, instead of the "Bread of Life" which came down from heaven.

In John 6:57 Jesus Christ Himself explains how to "feed" on His "body and blood," and in 1 Corinthians 10:17 Paul tells you that Christ's present **"body"** (1 Cor. 12:13) is *NOT the physical corpse that was taken down from the cross or the physical body that spoke John 6:63 or the physical body that held* **"the cup"** (see 1 Cor. 11:24–25).

This explains why no Roman Catholic who believes the private interpretations of Rome's Baalite priesthood ever knows for sure where he is going until he is DEAD. And it explains why in 1,500 years of church history the most detrimental and damnable influence on the real **"body of Christ"** (see 1 Cor. 12) has been this *official Catholic teaching* on the *sacrificial death of Jesus Christ.* No other false doctrine has damned more souls than that one *pagan blasphemy.* The number of Germans, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Italians, Poles, Mexicans, Filipinos, Spaniards, and Englishmen in Hell right now probably exceeds 2,000,000,000 (A.D. 325–A.D. 1991) through that "damnable delusion."

Submit to Rome's authority (see chapter one) and you are just as good as dead and in Hell as the men who wrote "every Catholic is a born-again Christian" (Knights of Columbus' pamphlet).

You could only believe the Catholic Church if you had renounced your sanity, and when you believed that the Mass, the Lord's Supper, and Calvary were the SAME sacrifice, you said good-bye to your brains *and your soul*. If every Catholic is a "born-again Christian," then you are in an illustrious company of members of the "one true and holy Apostolic faith" which includes: Adolph Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, Joseph Goebbels, Hermann Goering, Anton Pavelich, Rock Hudson, Al Capone, Archbishop Stepinac, Charlemagne, Fidel Castro, Francisco Franco, Benito Mussolini, Franz Stangl (Treblinka), Ted Kennedy, Rudolph Hoess (Auschwitz), Heydrich (the Hangman), Adolph Eichmann, Lucrezia Borgia, Lucky Luciano, Catherine DeMedici, Frank Sinatra, Vito Genovese (Mafia), Al Capone, Judy Garland, John Gotti, Louis XIV, Pablo Escobar, John Wilkes Booth, and Torquemada.

"Blessed be the tie that binds our hearts in Christian love! The fellowship of kindred minds is like to that above! What a fellowship, what a joy divine! Tis a glorious church without spot or wrinkle, washed in the blood of the Lamb!"

For eighty years, the Catholic Church has been trying to explain and justify these hellish and *ungodly* teachings. These apologetic tracts used to be "booklets" put out by the Knights of Columbus; they have now been replaced with folding paper tracts out of San Diego, California. All the themes are the same: *"Who Says the Catholic Church is Infallible?" "The Bible is NOT the Full Authority," "There is no Mistaking Christ's Church," (!!) "So You Have Been Saved?" "Can a Catholic Go Directly to God?" "The Rock that was Simon," "You are NOT Saved By Faith Alone," "What is The Catholic Church?" "Is it a Threat to American Freedom?" "What About Separation of Church and State?" "Yes, Catholics USE the Bible," "The Rosary, What is it?" "How Can Water be Holy?"* etc.

The gist of *every* apologetic listed is that no Bible believer "understands" the Catholic church, so all Bible believers "misrepresent it" or "slander it," so there is a need to EXPLAIN what the "true teaching" really is, etc.

We Bible believers *know* what it is. It is a fifteen-century operation of a two-faced, double-barreled, split-tongued, *two-headed cobra* with multiple authorities that can be switched, denied, quoted, abrogated, revised, adjusted, or restated to nullify ANY charge made against the old Whore on the Seven Hills.

No sane man with an IQ of 90 would subscribe to the essential "PLAN OF SALVATION" offered to him in the Catholic "Mass" unless he wanted to deliver his conscience to a religious organization so that the Living Lord and Saviour could have no hold over his personal life. This could best be done by reducing the Second Person of the Godhead to a WAFER, swallowing Him, digesting Him, *and ELIMINATING Him* (!!) until next Sunday, where you could return and RE-SWALLOW HIM. This is why the pagan priest addresses the wafer as "MY LORD AND MY GOD." *This blasphemous title is repeated every Sunday morning in 1992 in more than 50,000 Catholic "churches."* It explains the present spiritual condition of South Ireland, Spain, France, the U.S. Senate, Italy, the Rhineland, Bavaria, Mexico, Cuba, New England, South America, and Austria.

It also explains why Roman Catholics, as a class of sinners, are not *Bible readers* or students of the Scripture. In 400 years, the Catholic Church has never produced *ONE Biblical scholar* who did not *leave* the Catholic Church. There are no Biblical scholars connected with the Pope, and the

only Greek scholar who stayed in it back in 1500 had his Greek New Testament banned by his own church (Erasmus). We feed spiritually on words that are **"life"** according to the One who spoke the discourses on the Bread of Life in John 6 (see p. 61). We feed on THE WORD as Christ lived off His Father (John 6:57). We have tasted HIM (1 Pet. 2:1–3), *not a wafer someone pretended was "Him."* We are IN HIS BODY, not swallowing *pieces of it* (1 Cor. 12; Eph. 5:30), and **"we walk by faith, not by sight."** A jug of wine and "loaf of bread" (Rubiyat of Omar Khayyam) can be SEEN. They feed the flesh. We are not **"in the flesh"** (Rom. 8:9). *There is nothing SIMILAR about a Bible-believing Christian and a Roman Catholic*. They do not even RESEMBLE one another in beliefs or experience. They have two entirely different "gospels" and teach two entirely different ways of getting home to God in Heaven.

"**How long halt ye between two opinions?"**

"**No man can serve two masters!"**

Are All Popes Campbellites?

> "There is no such thing as ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY OF SALVATION DURING THIS LIFE"
>
> (Knights of Columbus, *This is the Catholic Church,* 1970, p. 13)

In the last chapter, you ran into the most shocking shock of all shockers: i.e., that every Roman Catholic (Hitler, Al Capone, Frank Sinatra, Rock Hudson, Hermann Goering, et al.) was a *"born-again Christian."* Where did this utterly unique funnyism come from? Imagine a "new birth" that produces lifelong killers, habitual adulterers, whoremongers, sadists, sex perverts, and egomaniacs by the thousand. Brother, that is some "new birth"—producing a "new creature in Christ" (2 Cor. 5:17). Swaggart was a *saint* alongside JFK.

Here are Karl Keating's buddies—the Knights of Columbus—right with him in late twentieth-century America (not the Dark Ages in Italy and Spain), and here is what *they* say: "WATER BAPTISM puts us into union with Christ, causes us to share His life, to the extent that His death is our own and His resurrection ours. We are dead to sin [Hitler, Himmler, Bloody Mary, Torquemada, Al Capone, and Ted Kennedy, for example!], alive to the new life of God. We are NEW PERSONS [like John Gotti, Benito Mussolini, Fidel Castro, or Rock Hudson!]. It is no wonder that St. Peter says 'baptism saves you.' This does not mean, of course, that water baptism is an automatic *guarantee* of salvation [i.e., you can become a **"new creature"** in Christ and go to Hell]. There is no such thing as an ABSOLUTE, INFALLIBLE *CERTAINTY* OF SALVATION DURING THIS LIFE" (Knights of Columbus, *This IS the Catholic Church,* p. 13).

Got the message? Ever see anything like it outside of Alice in Disneyworld or The Mad Hatter in Star Trek?

You become a "new person" in Christ, and "partake" of His death, burial, and resurrection, by a "new birth" that gives you "God's life" and having become dead to sin you live all of your life *doubting your salvation and, eventually, may wind up in Hell.* "THIS IS THE CATHOLIC

CHURCH" (see above). You see now why we said what we said back on page 9. Go back and read it; you may have thought, at the time, we were "over stretching things." We weren't. You can't "overstretch" the teachings of Unholy Mother Whore. She teaches OFFICIALLY and INFALLIBLY (see p. 35) that the *Apostle Paul* was a liar (2 Tim. 1:12; Rom. 8:29), that the *Apostle John* was a liar (1 John 5:10–13), and that the *Vicar of Christ* ("Blessed Simon Peter, the Prince of the Apostles") was *also* a liar (look what he wrote in 1 Pet. 1:4 and 2 Pet. 1:14–19).

All three "early Christians" had absolute assurance of salvation.

"Thus do all Catholics believe, and all are baptized. ALL ARE, THEREFORE, BORN-AGAIN CHRISTIANS" (*Does the Bible Contradict Itself?* Knights of Columbus, p. 42).

But they are Christians who don't know they are saved or where they are going!

There is nothing on Nintendo or the Teen-Aged Mutant Ninja Turtles that could compare with it. It is in a looney bin by itself. (And don't forget: you can't con a man unless he is crooked.)

Now, where would a deluded, deceived, bunch of Bible-perverting *pagans* go to concoct such a depraved, anti-Biblical heresy? Well, they would go right smack into John 3:5 as quickly as Alexander Campbell ever thought of doing it, and stick the word "baptism" into John 3:5, *where it is not found in any manuscript in any language used for any translation, of any version, on the face of this earth.* "Baptism, a SIGN [wrong, it is a **"figure"**] in Christ's Church is more than a sign [wrong, the "signs" are for Israel], it is AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY." "Unless a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God were Christ's words to Nicodemus" (ibid., p. 13). The "Knight" then goes on to say that it is WATER baptism that puts a man *into Jesus Christ* and it also CRUCIFIES A MAN WITH JESUS CHRIST.

(Southerners recognize the paw prints of the "water dogs" immediately; "Of those born of water, three are born outright: a tadpole, a mosquito, and a Campbellite.")

Here is the "infallible teaching" of the one "true, holy, apostolic" teaching church:

1. Sprinkling is baptism (*which it is not*).
2. The baptism of Romans 6 is water (*which it is not*).

3. The water of John 3 is baptism (*which it is not*).

4. You can be "born again" without being *saved*.

5. If you *lose* your new birth (i.e. become "unborn again"), you can be born "again and again and again" without being *re-sprinkled.*

This is the "infallible teacher" of Scripture, in action, as the "teaching Church" that was given authority by our Lord to "feed the sheep" and interpret the Scriptures. *You would be just as safe in the inner city of New York, stoned out of your skull on crack or cocaine.* Christ didn't say the dopers, junkies, rapists, hippies, pimps, muggers, whores, and prostitutes would receive the **"greater damnation."** He said the long-robed (Luke 20:46) **"fathers"** (Matt. 23:9) would receive it (Matt. 23:14).

On goes the "Knight" into the night.

"One may wonder how it is that a little water, either POURED or SPRINKLED, can produce such a tremendous effect on the soul. [Yes, buddy, "one sure may wonder"!] The REASON is that when the application of the water is accompanied by the words prescribed by our Lord it imparts A *MYSTERIOUS* EFFICACY to the water which it does not possess by itself" (op cit., p. 42).

Put fluoride in the city water, and you will come out a "Hard Shell."

Now, you can see how *African Black Magic* is the very heart and soul of the Roman Catholic "Church." Two times in a row, now, you have been told that PHYSICAL ELEMENTS (bread and water) are suddenly and *magically transformed* by a spoken formula so that they suddenly and mysteriously produce *SPIRITUAL* RESULTS (the Mass and Sprinkling). In both cases, the Catholic Church had to throw out the Scriptures to get their black magic performed. The first Scripture said the PHYSICAL produced *nothing* SPIRITUAL (John 6:63) in the Mass, and the second one said the PHYSICAL could produce *nothing* SPIRITUAL (John 3:6) in regards to baptism. Observe that each time a Catholic priest, Bishop, or Pope picks up the Bible he instinctively chooses the fleshy, material, physical parts and then PRETENDS they are *spiritual*. This is the work of an *unsaved man,* according to 1 Corinthians 2:1–4 and 2:14. It is the standard method of interpretation used by Rome and explains their constant resort to "mysteries," because *salvation to them is a complete mystery,* like it was NOT to Martin Luther, John Knox, Peter, James, and John, Paul, Billy

Sunday, Whitefield, Wesley, Moody, Finney, Booth, Edwards, Carey, Goforth, Judson, Talmage, Sam or Bob Jones, or any of their converts.

The Campbellite "plan of salvation" is identical to the Catholic system:

Both teach there is one true church: *their own church.*

Both believe "THE Church of Christ" is *their* church.

Both observe the Lord's Supper WEEKLY.

Both of them think *water* is essential for salvation.

Both teach no assurance of salvation till one is dead.

Both of them believe you can *lose* salvation.

Both of them do NOT think *water is necessary to regain salvation after one has lost it!*

At this point—before opening the Final Authority, the one that corrects the Roman Catholic Church as many as forty times in the New Testament alone—let us put ourselves into the shoes of a good, loyal, faithful, 100 percent American Roman Catholic who takes all of the Roman Catholic defenses of her doctrines (what we have been examining now for seventy pages) to be ABSOLUTE NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIAN TRUTH. We will not be "nominal" Catholics who practice "liberation theology" (Communism) or parade for "Gay Rights" and Abortion; no, we will be staunch, dyed-in-the-wool, hard-core, *dedicated Roman Catholics* who accept what the Popes and the Catholic Church believes and teaches, as it has been presented here by its main apologists (Karl Keating's *Catholic Answers,* and the Knights of Columbus, 1940–1992).

1. I am a born-again **"new creature"** in Christ who may become "unborn again" and go to Hell *after* being **"bone of his bone"** and **"flesh of His flesh"** (Eph. 5:30–32).

2. I am to *doubt* every promise of eternal security found in the Bible (Rom. 8:28–29; John 5:24; 1 Cor. 1:8–9; 1 Thess. 5:23–24) on the grounds that I am unable to understand these verses *and my church must interpret them for me.*

3. I was "born again" without exercising my will—as all five point TULIP Hard Shell Calvinists!—*for I was sprinkled before I could understand one word of John 3:16; Romans 10:9–10, 13; or John 1:12.*

4. Christ's blood did *not* purge away sins I commit in the future because my sprinkling only got rid of the "original sin" Adam committed.

So I will have to burn awhile to get into heaven because "no unclean thing shall enter there."

5. I cannot interpret my Bible, although I can USE it and READ it. Unfortunately, Christ gave the ability to interpret Scriptures only to Roman Catholic priests before He died. I am not one of these "elect," so if they tell me I am wrong about a certain Scripture I would be sinning against the Holy Ghost to call *them* liars.

6. Since my church is "incapable of TEACHING error" then all of her sins and errors were committed without being "TAUGHT." Thus, her support of Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco were *not* part of her "teaching." Her present support of Muhammad and the PLO and her approval of the murder of 250,000 Serbians in 1942 was not part of her "teaching." Her silent consent (and prayerful support) of Hitler's "Holocaust" was not part of her TEACHING: *it was part of her political activities aims, goals, and objectives*. She did not teach the Spanish Inquisition; it just "happened" through her priests, Cardinals, and Bishops. She did not *teach* anyone to burn people at the stake; *she just PRACTISED it 500 years.* She could not err in "teaching," for she is guarded by the Holy Spirit from "teaching ERROR." She doesn't *teach* anyone to persecute other religions; *her members have simply practised it for fifteen centuries,* as they are doing it NOW in the Philippines, Bosnia, Italy, Spain, and Mexico. My church cannot TEACH error. *However she may support it, promote it, encourage it, reward it, support it, and PRACTISE it.*

"*This* is the Catholic Church"!

"**By their fruits ye shall know them."**

"**And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"**

Having seen what the "one true, infallible, holy, apostolic church of Jesus Christ" TEACHES about salvation—as an "infallible interpreter of Scripture" that cannot "err"—let us turn to the Bible (any edition of any version) and see the difference between what God Almighty SAID and what these political opportunists thought He "meant."

1. *Water baptism doesn't SAVE anyone* (1 Pet. 3:21). When the "Knight" misquoted the verse (see above), he, like Eve, omitted what he didn't like (Gen. 3:2–3). He left out **"the like figure whereunto . . ."** which, naturally, all Campbellites omit. The reason for this perversion of

Scripture is that for Rome's private interpretation it is absolutely necessary; you see, the Bible makes water baptism a "FIGURE," not a *reality*. A *figure* is only a picture of something. The following "figures" mean nothing in *reality:* 2 plus 4 minus 1 equals 5. They are not a *reality* until they are 2, 4, and 1 pieces of money or men or women or apples or oranges or tables or chairs or churches or battleships, etc.

2. The souls who were **"saved by water"** (1 Pet. 3:19–21) *were neither immersed nor sprinkled, and no water was "poured" on them at all.* It was poured out on a drowned earth of lost people. The ones who got sprinkled and immersed *went to Hell* (see 2 Pet. 2:1–8).

The "infallible teacher" and "infallible interpreter" seems to have a hard time reading Latin, Greek, Coptic, Hebrew, Arabic, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Dutch, Hungarian, Russian, and Polish, as well as Chinese, Japanese, English, and Romanian.

3. There is no "baptism" in John 3:1–18, nor is there any *water* in Romans 6:1–4, although both passages were wrested out of their contexts. (See pages 25–26 for "differences among fundamentalists and the Holy Spirit doing a bum job"!)

4. The **"water"** in John 3:5 was a match to the **"flesh"** in the next verse, and the Lord Jesus only added it to John 3:3 because of Nicodemus' question about a man's PHYSICAL birth, which came *between the two verses* (vss. 3, 5).

Whoever the Catholics are counting on for "infallible interpretation," it certainly is not the Holy Spirit, the author of John's gospel. The Catholics added "baptism" to verse 5, subtracted **"flesh"** from verse 6, and then *omitted* the context in verse 4. This goes far beyond private interpretation; this is deliberate "wresting of the Scriptures to your own destruction" (2 Pet. 3:16). *It is intentional religious perversion designed to destroy souls.*

5. The first physical birth is a WATER birth; look at Genesis 1:20. So a man's wife is a **"fountain"** which produces children (Prov. 5:15–16, 18), as the whole nation of Israel is said to have come forth from the **"waters of Judah"** (Isa. 48:1). Jesus Christ's revision of His first statement (vs. 3) makes no sense at all unless you take into account verse 4; verse 4 deals with PHYSICAL birth. Nicodemus would never have connected water baptism with *a birth* of any kind. He would have connected *water baptism*

with purifying the flesh from sin (John 3:25–26; Heb. 9:13), *which is exactly what ALL Jews did* (see Acts 22:16).

You are to actually believe that the Lord Jesus Christ (who spoke the words; John 3:3, 5–7) authorized a "church" to pervert them, add to them, subtract from them, and then damn the souls of 900,000,000 people by making them think they could get a SPIRITUAL birth through a PHYSICAL medium. You are to believe (see chapter one) that Christ set up an "infallible church" that could not READ the Scriptures, STUDY the Scriptures, or BELIEVE the Scriptures, *while ridiculing those who accept them as the final authority* ("sola Scriptura"). That is what a "good" Catholic believes; *he believes a lie* (2 Thess. 2:12), *and a liar* (John 8:40–44).

There are SEVEN baptisms in the Scriptures (Matt. 3:11; 1 Cor. 10:1–4; 1 Cor. 12:13; Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:38; and Matt. 20:22) and *three* of them are not "water" baptisms. The Catholic-Campbellites simply read in the word "water" every time they see "baptism" in the New Testament (Eph. 4; Rom. 6; Gal. 4).

"*Thus do all Catholic BELIEVE and all are baptized. All are, therefore, 'BORN AGAIN' Christians"* (op cit., p. 42).

They are "born again" Christians who can be *"unborn again" at any moment,* who *doubt their salvation* all of their lives, who trust a *professional* liar to deceive them regarding their "new birth," who have been led to trust *physical things* (water, wine, and bread) instead of *spiritual things* (God, the Bible, and Jesus Christ), who are totally unable to read *sixth-grade English* where it goes against the grain of their bachelor priesthood, *who may drop into Hell at any moment,* and who would make a liar out of God just as quickly as look at Him (see Psa. 69:8–9 for example) if He dared correct their traditions, delusions, myths, and hallucinations.

Mary, Mary, Quite Contrary

> If you pray the rosary EVERY DAY, if you ALWAYS wear the scapular of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, SHE IS BOUND TO SAVE YOU FROM HELL, because she is bound by her promises."
> "God's Most Holy MOTHER will crush the Serpent's head."
> (*The Fatima Crusader,* 1991, pp. 26, 39)

By now it should be apparent that of all the evils in this sinful world in which we live, the greatest proponent, supporter, and propagator of *Scriptural corruption* in 1992 is the Roman Catholic Church. There may be Atheists who hate it more, Satanists who despise it more, and Moslems and Buddhists who ignore it more, but no one, absolutely no one, can *pervert* and *corrupt* the Bible like the Roman Catholic Church. This is because they profess not only to BELIEVE it but to be the *custodians*, protectors, *interpreters*, and *teachers* of it.

No Communist, Atheist, Agnostic, Moslem, or Satanist ever did as much to "make the word of God of none effect" as the Roman Catholic Church has done. She is an expert at it, for she has been practicing it since the days of Origen (A.D. 250). No Jehovah's Witness or "Moonie" or Mormon or Armstrongite ever destroyed as many souls USING THE BIBLE as Rome has. Her track record is untouchable. It would be safe to say that she has probably damned an average of 20,000,000 souls every ten years of her existence since A.D. 500. Back around A.D. 500–1000 it might have been less than this—say 13 to 15,000,000 souls, but this is atoned for in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by 90,000,000 to 100,000,000 souls every ten years.

Up here, in 1992, is Rome's *official teaching* on goddesses. There are no "goddesses" connected with Biblical Christianity. There is a goddess in the Roman Catholic museum of *theological freaks.* (She recently "converted Russia," according to Papists in America and Europe.) The goddess of Roman Catholicism is easy to identify, for she is OMNIPRESENT: that is, she can hear more than 600,000,000 parishioners all praying at the same time, although they are separated from each other by

anywhere from two to 12,000 miles. This goddess is a **"QUEEN,"** and the title given to her (**"the queen of heaven"**) is the identical title given by apostate Jews to a female demon in Jeremiah 44:17–19. *God destroyed Israel for worshipping* (Jer. 7:18) *this female "deity."*

Again, observe how going by the Scriptures, and by the Scriptures *alone* ("sola Scriptura"), DIVINE TRUTH is imparted which directly and blatantly *contradicts* Catholicism's "oral traditions" and "pre-Resurrection" teachings. The reason for dual authorities (*"The Bible and Tradition"*) is, by now, patently obvious: it is TO GET RID OF THE SCRIPTURES. **"The queen of heaven"** is a female deity (see Judg. 2:13, where she is called **"Ashtoroth"**—Istar, Easter, et al.), while the woman in Revelation 12 (clothed with the sun and crowned with twelve stars) is identified—contrary to oral tradition—as ISRAEL (see Gen. 37:9–10, *where the Holy Spirit interprets His own words after giving in the same book* [Gen. 40:8] *who the interpreter is*).

The "infallible teaching church"—who had to tell you "the Bible was inspired, otherwise you wouldn't know it" (see pp. 8–10)—makes Israel "MARY" and uses the passage (Rev. 12) to prove the "assumption of Mary," *after telling all its members that the Apocalypse is "hard to understand" and is full of figurative "symbols" which cannot be used to prove doctrines.*

"THIS IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH!"

This is the religious Whore.

Watch the old Whore justify another heresy.

"Likewise Christ our Redeemer is ever-living to make intercession for us. But we ask, 'Because Jesus Christ is our Redeemer is he the *sole mediator* between God and man?' (1 Tim. 2:5). Does this mean that the terms 'mediator' and 'intercessor' cannot be *used* IN ANOTHER SENSE and *applied* to others for DIFFERENT reasons?"

Different reasons? Why, the reason in 1 Timothy 2:5 *was to put you in contact with God.* "Another reason" would have to deal with something beside getting you in touch with God.

"Many do not seem to realize that Paul spoke of Jesus Christ as the one mediator between God and men. That does not exclude the POSSIBILITY or even HINT at the incongruity of there being *intermediaries between*

Jesus Christ and other men. Indeed the whole Bible takes such mediation for granted."

Whereupon you are assured that a DEAD WOMAN is needed to get you to Christ, not a personal worker or a soul winner or a preacher—as "the whole Bible takes such mediation for granted." All of the "mediators" mentioned in the Bible are LIVING: they are priests like Samuel and Aaron, prophets like Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, or Micaiah, kings like David, Solomon, or Hezekiah, preachers like Paul, Peter, Barnabas, and Stephen, or personal workers like Philip, Andrew, or Barnabas. *There are no dead "mediators" in either Testament. Samuel, hauled up* (1 Sam.), *refuses to "mediate."* The "Knight" simply used the typical Jesuit casuistry that is so characteristic of ALL Roman Catholic writers. A statement is made with nothing to back it up, and then, it is left undiscussed, pro or con, so you will arrive at a false conclusion. This is what was done in the Knights of Columbus' tract. *The truth* is that the Bible not only does NOT take such "mediation" for granted; *it totally omits it in all sixty-six books which contain more than 31,000 verses.*

What are the actual SCRIPTURES produced to show that a dead Jewish housewife with a family (see Mark 6:3; Psa. 69:8–9; John 2:17) is a SUPERNATURAL GODDESS who can hear 800,000,000 people pray at the same time? Here it is on pages 34–35 (op cit.).

1. Mary was the MEDIUM through which Christ came.
2. This means you can alter the word "medium" to "MEDIATRIX."
3. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were MEDIUMS for writing.
4. A man who baptizes is a "MEDIATOR between men and Christ"—BUT NOT BETWEEN MEN AND GOD!
5. So Andrew "mediated" in John 1:40–42.
6. First Timothy 4:16 proves that a MEDIATOR can save himself from HELL as well as those who hear him.
7. John the Baptist was a "mediator" in John 1:35–37.

This is the official teaching of the so-called infallible "interpreter" whom Jesus Christ promised would be "preserved from error" in her "infallible teaching." If you don't mind, we will just CORRECT this mythological "Jesus" who gave Rome this non-existent authority, and we will correct him *five times in a row* without blinking.

1. *Not one man or woman listed above was DEAD when he or she "mediated."* None of them were *called* "mediators."

2. Not one man or woman listed "mediated" AFTER the Holy Spirit came to indwell the body of the believer (John 14–16). *Not one man was called a "mediator."*

3. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John do not perform as "mediums" of any kind. They write under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and not one of them is appealed to in prayer one time before, during, or after their lives are over. Their MEDIUM is paper and ink. *No writer of a gospel is called a "mediator" anywhere in the Bible.*

4. No man (preacher, pastor, baptizer, Catechist, priest, pope, bishop, layman, deacon, or teacher), since Pentecost, "mediated" for anyone, for he was merely a sinful MAN and there is only **"one mediator between God and men."** It is NOT another "man." To get around this obvious truth, you see, the Papists have *added a verse* that is not in Timothy. They have added "There are many mediators between Christ and man." Why are they then not called "mediators."? This denies the Deity of Jesus Christ, for the statement in 1 Timothy 2:5 *is written AFTER the resurrection.*

5. First Timothy 4:16 has nothing to do with anyone going to Hell, anymore than does 1 Timothy 2:15. The thing is, you are dealing with people who cannot read English, Greek, Hebrew, German, Spanish, Italian, Latin, Russian, or French New Testaments. The word "SAVE" in both passages, by the same author, has no more reference to "Hell" than Romans 14:23.

The poor, egotistical, deluded fool who first put this private interpretation on the two passages was the same pagan idiot who thought that **"castaway"** in 1 Corinthians 9:27 was *a reference to a gospel minister going to Hell.* The apostle Paul was no more worried about going to Hell (see Rom. 8:29–38) than he was drowning in Lake Michigan. It is the Catholic Knights of Columbus and their priests WHO ARE WORRIED about going to Hell (see pp. 66–68 for confirmation). And well they may have a right to! Bible-believing Christians who believed Romans 8:29 knew that their own destination was as fixed as the law of gravity: even more fixed, for in 2 Peter 3:8–12 the law of gravity is done away with, but our salvation is not (see Isa. 51:5–6).

First Timothy 4:16 is a reference to the salvation of a MINISTRY, exactly as it is found again in 1 Corinthians 9 by the same author. But that "interpretation" was rejected by sinners who did not know where they were going when they died (p. 66) because they had added to (see p. 67) and subtracted from the Holy Scriptures (see p. 73), and obtained a CURSE (Gal. 1:8–10) which they tried to place on others (see p. 1).

There is not one overstatement in the last paragraph.

"THIS IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH!"

Our "infallible teacher" and "infallible interpreter" is nothing but a *Bible-perverting BLOCKHEAD.*

To Hell with her *teaching* and her *interpreting*.

"Another Biblical example (!!) of mediation is John 2. Mary was "Mediatrix." Our Lord surely sensed the situation, but He waited until it was called to HIS ATTENTION by Mary [Boy, look at the Satanic implications found in that line of blarney!]. Because Mary's PRAYER was so effective in this case, and INDUCED her son to anticipate the time when He planned to perform His first miracle, many believe in the power of HER PRAYERS" (op cit., p. 36).

There isn't one prayer recorded anywhere in the entire chapter (John 2). Read it. In John 2, Christ refuses to call Mary His "mother" (John 2:4) as *He constantly refuses to call her His mother* (see John 19:26 and Mark 3:34–35), and in John 2 you are shown that Jesus Christ's mother had other children *born of her own body:* cf. John 2:17 with Psalm 69:8–9.

Mary couldn't get Jesus Christ to call her "MOTHER" *one time in three and one-half years of public ministry.* She is simply **"woman"** (John 2:4, 19:26).

"WE believe she was the MOTHER of God" (see p. 76). "Speak for yourself, John Alden!" *No Christian in the New Testament believed anything of the kind.*

"Not only do we find the *early* Christians [no Christians *anywhere in the Book of Acts for thirty years after the Resurrection*] addressing prayers to God, but to OTHER CHRISTIANS as well." Proof? So help me, Funiculi-Finicula, the reference given is Romans 15:30, where Paul's normal request has been *converted* into a prayer by *pretending* that Paul was praying TO the Christians instead of asking them to pray *for* him.

The Knight—and I mean "night," with a capital "N"—is trying to get you to think that Paul is getting down on his knees and *orally praying* thusly: "Oh Urbane, Apelles, Priscilla, and Aquilla. Oh Rufus, Junia, and Andronicus, I beseech thee in the name of Mary, Persis, Marcissus, Tryphosa, and Tryphaena, that you pray for me." Thus a *written request* in a *letter* is transformed into a prayer in *private devotions.* This, after saying that prayer is made to GOD (Acts 12:5) not the "brethren," and that the "brethren," right in the passage, are told to pray to **"God"** (Rom. 15:30)—NOT "THE BRETHREN." If Paul had been what this depraved Catholic thought he was he would have prayed, "I beseech you brethren...that ye strive together with me in your prayers to the brethren for me." He didn't say that; he said **"God."**

There is no perverted, Bible corrupter like a Roman Catholic "priest."

There is no Bible-corrupting *pervert* like the Roman Catholic Church. She is in a class by herself. Imagine someone thinking that Paul's *written request* in Romans 12:1 was Paul going through a "mediator" to contact Jesus Christ *when Jesus Christ was inside HIS BODY* (Col. 1:27).

"THIS IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH!" (1992)

Now, we have not yet even referred to the verses that describe the Biblical "Mary" and laid them alongside the pagan "Queen of Heaven," invented by pagan worshippers of goddesses. The definitive work on this is Hislop's *The Two Babylons,* published many years ago (1916). The "Mary" demon of Catholicism referred to as "The Holy Tabernacle," "The Gate to Heaven," "The Mother of God," "God's Masterpiece," etc., has nothing to do with the Jewish maiden who gave birth to Christ and offered a sacrifice for purification as any Jewish woman would have had to do (Lev. 12).

The "Mary" of the Bible is ignored in the PRAYER room, *where PRAYER is being made* (Acts 1:14). No disciple present asks her for the time of day. *There are no "early Christians"* (A.D. 33 to A.D. 90) *who ask Mary for a weather report, before or after Calvary.* Christ never calls her His "mother" at any time when speaking to her, and He insults her publicly by declaring that He has MULTIPLE "mothers" (Matt. 12:50) whom He calls *"mothers,"* not *"women"* (John 2:4, 19:26). The "Mary" of Scripture gives birth to a number of children, both male and female, and Jesus Christ refers to them as **"my mother's children"** (Psa. 69) *in every version of the Scripture*, in *any* translation, from *any* set of manuscripts ever translated by

anyone. The Mary of the Bible is no more "sinless" than Orpah or Ruth. She had to obtain purification for her *uncleanness* (Lev. 12) on at least SIX TIMES after Jesus Christ was born (Mark 6:3; Lev. 12:1–6). If she didn't, she sinned against God in violating the Law she was born under and lived under, as a Hebrew. The *historical Mary* was a JEWESS.

Mary is not the "Co-Redemptrix" of Catholic mythology.

The Roman Catholic *female demon* is described in 1975 (AFTER Vatican II) in *Christ Among Us* (Anthony Wilhelm, Paulist Press, pp. 90–91, 367–371) as follows:

"God has relatives...God has a MOTHER."

"She was closer to Christ than anyone else."

"To honor HER is to honor GOD" (*Uni-sex,* New Age Women's Lib!)

"She was conceived *without sin,* remained SINLESS throughout her life, and was perpetually a virgin." Thus making a liar out of the Holy Spirit *four times in a row* and, thus, giving Mary two attributes of DEITY *which she no more had than she had four legs.*

All human beings are born in sin (Job 15:14; Psa. 51:5), *none are sinless* (Ecc. 7:20; Rom. 3:10–12). If Mary remained "perpetually a virgin," she *sinned against her husband* (1 Cor. 7:5; 1 Thess. 4:6). Jesus Christ said she had children (Psa. 69:8). You can see now (chapter one) why these godless pagans were so intent on adding "ORAL TRADITION" to "sola Scriptura" (chapter one). Now you see what they were able to do with the dual authorities elevated to an equal level with Scripture. They were able to make a liar out of *the Author of Scripture* every time He opened His mouth (2 Pet. 1:20), and He DID open His mouth (Matt. 13:35).

"*We believe* she was taken into heaven body and soul at the end of her earthly life." Another attribute of Deity stolen from Jesus Christ and added to a fictitious goddess. "We believe" doesn't *mean* anything. It means anyone who wants to believe what they want to believe, *can believe anything they want to believe* if they are willing to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, tromp the Scriptures underfoot, and correct them with their own "belief."

"Mary is the modern CHRISTIAN."

"Mary is particularly the model of our worship."

Two honest, open, bald-faced confessions that no genuine Roman Catholic *ever believed three-fourths of the New Testament.*

Mary is the "model" Old Testament Jew, *under the Law;* there are no "Christians" anywhere in *any* version of any translation of *any* Bible from *any* set of manuscripts until Acts 11:26. Mary was no more a CHRISTIAN than John the Baptist.

The "model of our worship" that God Almighty gave to every New Testament Christian on this earth—bar none—was *not* a Jewish maiden under the Law, but a converted Pharisee *under grace:* read 1 Timothy 1:16; Colossians 1:24; 1 Corinthians 11:1; and Philippians 4:9. *Some vile hypocrite has gotten rid of EVERYTHING God told a Christian to do in this age.* Mary was *not* a soul winner; Paul was. She was *not* a personal worker; Paul was. She was *not* whipped or imprisoned; Paul was. She wrote *nothing;* Paul wrote ALL the instructions to the Roman Catholic Church at Rome. She was *not* a preacher or evangelist; Paul was. She was not given *one revelation* about anything in Scripture beyond Genesis–Malachi; Paul was given revelations beyond Malachi that took thirteen epistles to record. Mary was not caught up to paradise; *Paul was,* and it is *recorded* that he was (2 Cor. 12). Mary did not die as a martyr; Paul did.

The "official teaching church" with its "infallible teaching protected from error" just *STOLE your entire New Testament commission for you as given by the Holy Spirit in thirteen epistles.* They took your "model" from you and referred you to a fictitious, female SPOOK.

"*THIS* IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH!" Amen!

Now, go back and look at what some poor, depraved sinner tried to do to your mind. He made you think that *his own people*—Roman Catholics: not just "many believe in, etc."—have faith to believe that AFTER Mary died she could still PRAY to Jesus Christ like she did when she was alive in John 2. *In the first place, she prayed for nothing when she was alive*. In the second place, nothing in her request had anything to do with *anyone* GETTING TO CHRIST or GETTING TO GOD or GETTING HEALED or GETTING TO HEAVEN or finding out THE TRUTH. Her request was for *physical drink.* All Roman Catholics have an obsession with physical materialism (see pp. 72–73).

Mary didn't even ASK anything; she made a flat statement: **"They have no wine."** And when she says this, there is not present, within 12,000 miles North, South, East, or West, *one "CHRISTIAN."* No one in John 2 is trying to find Christ or God or Jesus Christ or "Jesus" or forgiveness of sins

or salvation. In view of these perfectly obvious fourth-grade truths, what in the name of pepperoni-pizza is this *godless prayer* doing in the Catholic Church?

"WE BESEECH YOU, MARY, THROUGH OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND BY THE CHARITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT . . ." (op cit., p. 32).

How do you use Jesus Christ as the MEDIUM ("THROUGH OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST") to reach the *medium* you think can put you in contact *with Jesus Christ?* Amazing, isn't it? "Holy Mary, MOTHER OF GOD, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death." *Is this how Paul prayed?*

Knight: "If you SUBSTITUTE the name of Mary or any saint, in the place of **'my brethren'** in St. Paul's prayer, you have identically the SAME PRAYER which the Catholic church offers to Mary and the saints."

Right: *you have sacrilegious blasphemy.*

This is what these blasphemous pagans did with Romans 15:30. They substituted *their own words* for the *words of God*. Then they told you that you could not understand the words of God (pp. 20–25but needed THEM (with their substitutions; see above) to teach you what these words really "meant." If you take their barbaric ravings or their whimsical fancies seriously you will wind up with them. That is why they warned *you* about going to Hell AFTER *YOUR* "NEW BIRTH."

The Roman Catholic "Church" is (according to every piece of evidence it presents, plus the evidence of its enemies) the *greatest religious perverter of Biblical truth the world has ever known.* Holding fast to enough "fundamentals" (see BJU's "creed") to pass off as an authentic "Christian" outfit, the Vatican hierarchy has succeeded in corrupting every BIBLICAL truth revealed to mankind by God. Not even the Virgin Birth of Christ or the Deity of Christ was left unadulterated. God winds up with a "mother," thus denying Jesus Christ's membership in the *Godhead as the Second Person of the Trinity*, and then His human Adamic mother—who never experience the new birth at the time of Christ's birth or His death—was given TWO of His attributes: a *sinless conception and a sinless life, in order to compete with Him.*

Then finally—horror of all pagan horrors—she shows up in the "after life" as an OMNIPRESENT goddess who can *hear* and *answer*,

simultaneously, the prayers of 800,000,000 superstitious pagans scattered from Dublin to Manila and from Hollywood to Rome.

The Most Rev. Timothy Manning, Aux. Bishop of Los Angeles laid hands on the Rev. Clark Butterfield on the 29th day of May, 1965 at 9 a.m. and officially ordained him to the Roman Catholic priesthood. Do you know what "Father" Butterfield says the Catholic Church teaches? He said that the "teaching authority" of the "infallible interpreter of Scripture" (see chapter one) states that no grace comes from God to man EXCEPT IT PASS THROUGH MARY'S HANDS (*Night Journey From Rome,* p. 74).

"**There is...one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."**

Someone is lying in 1992. You don't have to guess who it is.

Instead of giving yourself to Jesus Christ, Rome says you are to give yourself to *Mary*. Not one part of your body or being can be reserved for Jesus Christ: "OH MARY, MY QUEEN and MY MOTHER, I give myself *ENTIRELY to THEE,* and to show my devotion to THEE, I consecrate to THEE this day my eyes, my ears, my mouth, my heart, *MY WHOLE BEING,* WITHOUT RESERVE" (Catholic Prayer of Consecration to Mary, op cit., p. 67).

In the Bible, you were bought by Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 6:20), *not Mary.* You belong to Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 3:23); your body, soul, and spirit are His (1 Thess. 5:23), *not Mary's.* You are to give *Him* your members and your body (Rom. 12:1–2, 6:13), and you are not to give "Mary" the time of day, not even on an "off-day." Let Mary "tend to her knittin'."

If you want her to pray for YOU then YOU "hail" her. But don't waste our time thinking we Bible-believing Christians need the prayers *of any woman who wouldn't go to bed with her own husband* (1 Cor. 7:1–7) and then showed up as "Queen of Heaven." Tell that "Mary" to knock it off. Jezebel or Lucrezia Borgia would be just as good a Christian "model." Tell "Mary" if she is "Queen of Heaven" to pray for *herself* because we have *Jesus Christ* praying for us (John 14:16, 17:9), and the *Holy Spirit* making intercession for us (Rom. 8:26), so we don't have time to waste with a tin-horn, fairy queen living in "never-never" land.

Female goddesses are as common to paganism as beads, candles, and purgatories. "Mary" was called Venus, Diana, Minerva, Ashtoreth, Artemis, the Lorelei, the "El" Woman, Semiramis, Istarte, and Astarte, long before

the Catholic "Mary" entered the handicaps to get some bets placed on her. In Revelation 17, "Mary" is called **"BABYLON THE GREAT."** She has *nothing* in common with the Jewish maiden who had seven children and who will rise in the judgment with the Queen of Sheba (Matt. 12:42) to condemn every "Roman Catholic" who ever lived if that pagan Papist was stupid enough to have prayed to her or kneeled before an image of her or called her God's "mother."

It is ignorance of the Bible—*Roman Catholics are NOT Bible readers*—that allows the Catholic hierarchy to project such pagan blasphemies in the name of "Christianity." There are no regular *Bible readers* on the face of this earth who would be stupid enough to think that the Biblical Mary's body was anywhere but moldering in a cemetery waiting for the first resurrection.

And this ends our brief survey of *The Corrupt Catholic Cult.* The old whore is just as corrupt and defiled as she was in the days of "Clement of Rome" and the other church "fathers." *Vatican II changed nothing*. She still damns her constituents right and left, a dozen times a day, in every country on earth where there is a "parish priest" or a convent or a monastery. Catholics were never in subjection to the Bible and *never will be*. Rome will always *profess* to believe it in order to pervert it. Her adherents will follow and believe *her* instead of the Author of Scripture, for *she* is unholy and *He* is holy.

When you get to Hell you'll get your theology straightened out.

1. In the Bible, the CHURCH is Christ's body; to a Papist, the church is the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

2. *In the Bible*, you enter the church by a new birth which the Holy Spirit imparts when you believe on Jesus Christ; *in the Catholic Church*, you enter it when a priest sprinkles (or pours) water on you.

3. *In the Bible*, you come to God directly through His Son Jesus Christ, whom you contact DIRECTLY; *the Papists* get to Christ through Mary, the sacraments, and dead saints.

4. *In the Bible*, you commemorate Christ's death with a supper to show His Second Coming: *the Papists* re-enact Christ's death with an unbloody "sacrifice" for the souls in "purgatory."

5. *In the Bible,* the Scriptures are self-interpreting and *contradict every Roman Catholic doctrine found in this book;* to a Papist, the Bible is a

mysterious enigma that only the Catholic hierarchy can interpret, and you must accept their interpretation every place where *they* contradict Scripture.

6. *In the Bible*, Christ's one final and perfect, completed atonement completely saves and justifies and PREDESTINES the believer to wind up just like Jesus Christ; *in Rome*, no one has his destination fixed, and Christ's sacrifice must be repeated through the centuries because it does not save anyone "for sure" (see p. 65).

7. Our Bible contains sixty-six books; a Roman Bible contains *seventy-three.*

8. In our Bible, *Mary is a sinner* who gets saved by believing on a Saviour, and she is never called "mother" one time by Jesus Christ; *in Catholic mythology* Mary is not only a sinlessly conceived mother of Christ, SHE IS THE SINLESS MOTHER OF GOD.

9. *In the Bible*, the CHURCH is built on Jesus Christ the Rock (see 1 Cor. 10:1–4; Deut. 32); in *Catholic folklore*, it is built on SATAN (see Matt. 16:18–23), represented by Simon Peter.

10. *In the Bible*, all sin and all sins are PURGED by Christ's blood (Heb. 1:3, 9:22); in *Catholicism's Disneyworld* of pagan private interpretation, they are purged by FIRE.

Biblical Christianity and Roman Catholicism do not "touch base" at *one point* on the ball diamond. There is NOTHING about Roman Catholicism that resembles *Biblical Christianity* where it deals with the Second Commandment, Mary's birth or death or family or position in the Body of Christ, salvation, sanctification, water baptism, justification, the Lord's Supper, imputed righteousness, prayer life, attitude towards dead saints, soul winning, life after death, Israel, the local church, the authority of the Scriptures, the identification of the Mother of Harlots or the Man of Sin (2 Thess 2; Rev 17).

Only someone with a spiritual and mental "blackout" would think the two had ANYTHING in common. He would have to be totally ignorant of what the "infallible church" teaches. The Catholic church teaches NOTHING that is true that isn't as plain as the nose on your face in ONE gospel—John. And the rest of the mass of ersatz, pagan, heretical nonsense she teaches cannot be found anywhere in any Bible; *not even her own "Bibles."* This explains why every "recognized," Biblical scholar who ever lived (Bullinger, Stam, Luther, Dake, Robertson, Scofield, Pember, Sauer,

Warfield, Wilson, Deissmann, Briggs, Wuest, Adam Clark, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, John Peter Lange, et al.) was ANTI-CATHOLIC. Not even the ecumenical "borderliners" (Hort, Delitzsch, Schaff, Nestle, Aland, Metzger, et al.) stayed in the Catholic Church. BIBLICAL CHRISTIANITY and ROMAN CATHOLICISM are as "polarized" as ORTHODOX JUDAISM and the GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH.

The greatest corrupter of Biblical Christianity in the late twentieth century is still the one who corrupted it through the last fifteen centuries: ROME, THE GREAT PRIVATE INTERPRETER.

Or, to quote the Knights of Columbus:

"THIS IS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH!"

Postscript

What "Catholic Answers" Withheld From the Suckers

"In practise, however, the words 'faith and morals' can be stretched to cover many other questions, such as, for example, POLITICS. Moreover, Pius XII [Hitler's buddy!] held that even his encyclicals were *ex cathedra pronouncements*."

"The Pope...he is the Vicar of Christ, who is and always will be *supreme head of THE church of Christ*, to which Christ Himself promised His present help even unto the end of the world. May God grant that the ecumenical council announced by the *Holy Father* (!!) may help bring about the union of all Christians of the East and the West *in the true Church of Christ."*

"There are TWO great obstacles to Christian unity; the PAPAL CLAIM to infallibility and PAPAL supremacy." [Note: Baptists, Presbyterians, the Bible, doctrinal creeds, Methodists, street preachers, and anti-Catholics are NOT the obstacles. Both obstacles to Christian unity originate among Catholics in the Catholic Church: the ones who profess to want "unity"!"

"There is only *ONE road to unity* and that is the road to ROME...the world's only coherent total and accepted expression of FAITH, as well as the SOLE AUTHORITY recognized the world over, as far as Christianity is concerned, is to be found in the (ROMAN) CATHOLIC CHURCH."

"A priest living alone must not have television. A priest may quench his thirst quickly standing at a bar...but should not sit down in a cafe to do it. Priests should not smoke *in public*. Catholics must not go to motion picture shows without first assuring themselves that the film being shown CONFORMS TO THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH."

"The Italian word for 'pope' (Papa) is formed by taking the first syllables of two Latin words: Pater Pauperum—'THE FATHER OF THE POOR.'"

Pius XII always rode in a *Cadillac;* John XXIII changed to the German make (*Mercedes*).

"They walk in the path of dangerous ERROR who believe that they can *accept Christ* as head of the Church while not adhering loyally to His Vicar on earth." (I.e., Dwight L. Moody, Billy Sunday, J. Frank Norris, Billy Graham, Charles G. Finney, W. B. Riley, Bob Jones Sr., Mordecai Ham, Oswald Smith, John Knox, William Booth, Martin Luther, Jack Hyles, George Whitefield, John Rawlings, John R. Rice, Beauchamp Vick, David Livingstone, Adoniram Judson, Curtis Hutson, William Carey, C. T. Studd, Billy Bray, John Paton, Charles Fuller, and Dr. DeHaan, with ALL OF THEIR CONVERTS.)

"The ecumenical council [John XXIII] has ordinary and supreme authority *within the* [Roman] *universal church.* It is distinguished from that of the Roman Pontiff solely by the number of persons who can exercise it. The POPE has the same complete and supreme jurisdiction within the [Roman] universal church. There is a close relationship between the two, in the sense that while the power of the Roman Pontiff is UNIVERSAL, SINGLE, UNIQUE, and SUPREME (!) these same qualities *cannot be attributed to the ecumenical council* (Vatican II) *without its union with the Vicar of Christ."* [Note: *nothing* Vatican II decided was authoritative or binding on ANYONE unless they first recognized the "Papa" as the SUPREME authority on this earth.]

"Catholic literature tends to foster the HISTORICAL ILLUSION that Christendom was united before Martin Luther. Actually, the Church has been troubled with division since the days of the New Testament."

(Robert Neville, *The World of the Vatican,* Harper and Row, 1962, pp. 119–120, 130, 159–160, 232, 235, 240, 246, and 248.)

Other works available on Kindle
Entire publication list at
www.kjv1611.org